

LP
F
5012
1868
pg 0



3 9004 01480682 9

868 P 30

THE
ORGAN QUESTION

LINE UPON LINE

OR

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCHES

PSALM CL 4.—*Praise him with stringed instruments and organs.*¹

REPORTS OF DISCUSSIONS IN THE COURTS OF THE CANADA
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN 1867, ON AN OVERTURE
FROM KNOX CHURCH, MONTREAL

MONTREAL:

PUBLISHED BY MURRAY & CO., STATIONERS HALL

1868

THE
ORGAN QUESTION

LINE UPON LINE

OR

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCHES

PSALM CL. 4.—*Praise him with stringed instruments and organs.*

REPORTS OF DISCUSSIONS IN THE COURTS OF THE CANADA
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN 1867, ON AN OVERTURE
FROM KNOX CHURCH, MONTREAL

MONTREAL:

PUBLISHED BY MURRAY & Co., STATIONERS HALL

1868

L
F5012
1868P90

PREFACE.

The question of Instrumental Music as an aid in praising God has, within the last few years, been receiving much attention from leading minds, both clerical and lay, in the Presbyterian Churches of Britain and the Colonies. The Church of Scotland, it seems, has wisely determined to accord the right of settling all questions bearing upon internal forms of worship to the congregations themselves, providing always that no change of forms shall infringe upon the laws of the Church on the one hand, nor upon the peace of the congregation upon the other. Such a rule seems as wise as it is prudent. It guards the jurisdiction of the Superior Courts against treason, and the rights of the people against tyranny, and the enacting of such a law implied that the figment called in Ecclesiastical *parlance* "Use and Wont" is not in every instance an infallible guide of right. We, as Presbyterians, do not hold that a Presbyterian Synod is infallible, nor do we believe that a Presbytery may not err; and we have not so learned our Presbyterian catechism as to believe and teach that the *only* duties of a Kirk Session are to enforce the arbitrary and harsh measures of a Superior Court upon a reclaiming congregation. We always thought that a Kirk Session's duty consisted at least as much in protecting the *interests and rights* of the congregation as in defending the *dignity* of a majority in the Upper Courts. So that if a majority of any congregation should claim in a constitutional way certain rights and privileges which they most conscientiously believe to be in harmony with the Word of God, though at variance with "Use and Wont" in the Church, surely the Kirk Session, in such a case, should give the claims of such a congregational majority a favourable consideration. As regards "Use and Wont," which seems to be the grand argument against Instrumental Music in the Presbyterian Church, it may be well to observe that "Use and Wont" are not infallible. It was contrary to "Use and Wont" for Christ to open a blind eye, or unstop a deaf ear, or heal a palsied mendicant on the Sabbath day. It was contrary to "Use and Wont" for Peter, and John to preach salvation and work miracles in the "name of Jesus of Nazareth." It was contrary to "Use and Wont" for Martin Luther, John Calvin, and John Knox to preach justification by faith in the atonement of the Son of God. It was contrary to "Use and Wont" for a Court in the Church of Scotland to admit to the privileges of sitting and voting a minister of a *quoad sacra* charge. Nay, more, it is contrary to "Use and Wont" to have a choir. It is contrary to "Use and Wont" to sing God's praise without reading the psalm line by line. It is contrary to "Use and Wont" to have only one table at the Communion of the Lord's Supper.

The most intelligent and pious of our Presbyterian community have come to the conclusion that, both on the warrant of Scripture and expediency, it is befitting that our churches should avail themselves of the aid of good music well rendered in worshipping God.

The arguments in the following pages from Holy Writ settle the question of a divine warrant for instrumental aid, and the history of the past, as well as the growing wants of the present, fully establish the question of expediency. Some of the first Presbyterian families in Canada are now found in the ranks of Episcopacy and Methodism, and it is needless to say that they have fled for refuge to communions where the discipline is less rigid than our own, for among the ranks of Evangelical piety we find many such families in the foreground; but why have they left the Presbyterian pale? The answer is

too many cases is that our music is intolerable ; and while a goodly number of our old people may remain with us, yet their children will not. Dr. William Chalmers, of London, stated on the platform of the U. P. Synod at Edinburgh, in last May, that of 100,000 Scotchmen who had settled in England within the last quarter of a century, the Presbyterian Church had not now 30 per cent. Are all these 70 per cent. bad men, ungodly men, unprincipled men, fugitives from discipline, and otherwise unworthy, because they could worship God more devoutly in the Puritan, the Methodist, or Episcopal Church than in that of their fathers? It is vain for an affected pietism and assumed stedfastness of principle to say of all these excellent people who have left our church, that they are low or loose in their views and habits, or that they are fugitives from order and discipline. Such is an unwarrantable libel on their character and their moral and religious worth. They are in many instances among the best of our citizens, the most active in the cause of Christian philanthropy, and the foremost in every good work. They are lost to our cause, but not to the cause of Christ, and our Church is blameworthy because she has literally driven many of them from her communion.

The case of Knox Church, which has brought the subject at this time so prominently forward, may be stated in very few words. Acting upon the belief that the use of instrumental music was one of these non-essential matters, not sinful nor unlawful in themselves, which might be employed in the worship of God, when a congregation is unanimous in its adoption, the managers of Knox Church, with the full sanction of the members, provided in their plans when building, a place for an organ. The subscriptions of many of the members were given on the distinct understanding that a musical instrument of some kind would be used to assist the congregation in praise, and that an organ would be got as soon as possible. The resignation of their pastor before the new church was completed, having rendered it necessary that the services of another minister should be obtained, it was distinctly intimated to those who were applied to as candidates for the vacancy, that it was intended that congregational singing was to be assisted by an instrument. There was no concealment, there was complete agreement among all the members, and a thorough spirit of unanimity on the subject. At the same time there was no desire to act rashly, or in even apparent opposition to any law or regulation of the Synod, and the fact that an organ was used in one of the congregations in the West, showed that no law existed against their use. On one occasion, however, the instrument now complained of was used in a congregational meeting, and at the request of many of the members it was not removed, but was used on the following Lord's Day. So marked was the improvement that it was unanimously agreed, not only by those who had taken an active part in building the church, but by those who had joined it since its erection, and some of whom had entertained strong doubts on the subject, that the instrument should remain. For about nine months not the slightest objection was heard from any quarter, until three ministers of the Presbytery, having charges in the country, called attention to the matter on their own mere motion, and without any complaint having been laid before any Church Court. The history of that proceeding will be found fully related in the following pages ; but it may not be out of place here to say that these reverend gentlemen stated, and appeared to feel keenly the position in which they had been placed, that they had been made the cat's-paws of City members of the Presbytery, who sought by their instrumentality to strike a blow at the congregation then being newly organized. They, no doubt, believed at the time that they were doing their duty, and every credit must be given them for their ignorant zeal. Calmer reflection has, there is reason to believe, led them to regret the step they then took, and subsequently followed up at the Synod. This late regret, however keen, will not undo the serious mischief they have occasioned, nor make up for the evils they have caused by disturbing the harmony which existed in the congregation whose rights were so needlessly invaded.

There were three forms in which the question of instrumental music was brought before the Synod. Two of these being what may be termed personal, and one taking up the general subject. The first in order was the consideration of the protest and appeal of the Rev. Messrs. Gordon and Cameron, with those adhering, against the decision of the Presbytery of Montreal, in reference to the non-reception by the office-bearers of Knox Church of a committee, which, it was held, had cited them irregularly and contrary to the laws of the church, the committee having been appointed simply for conference, and not empowered to *deal* with the office-bearers, in the sense in which that term is understood in the courts of the Presbyterian Churches. This case, although arising out of the use of instrumental music, was decided upon other considerations, and resolved itself into a question of the legal forms to be used in citations. Having been argued fully, no further reference is here necessary to this decision. Then followed the discussion on the general question of instrumental music in churches, at which the Commissioners from Knox Congregation were present, and had an opportunity of fully stating their case. The decision came to, had it been allowed to stand as it appears in the wording of the resolution—the Rev. Mr. King—as was evident from his having subsequently proposed a motion, which was agreed to, by which the session of Knox Church were ordered to remove the instrument they had in use, while one which had been employed for several years in a congregation in the Presbytery of Hamilton was allowed to remain, and was not interfered with. The gross inconsistency of Mr. King, and of others who supported him in his propositions, must be apparent to every one who gives the matter the slightest consideration. It is evident from the fact of an organ being in use with the sanction and concurrence of the Synod, that the practice is not wrong in itself, nor contrary to the laws of the Church. If, notwithstanding this concurrence of the Synod, Mr. King still holds the use of instrumental music to be unlawful, then he admits that in the case of the church referred to in the Presbytery of Hamilton, where the organ is employed, he and the Synod acted exactly as they charge the Jesuits with teaching, “they did evil that good might come.” The difference between the two cases is very simply told. The church in the West was connected with the American Presbyterian Church, and sought admission to the Canada Presbyterian Church. It not being *sinful* in the first of these bodies to make use of instrumental music in leading the praises of the sanctuary, and not being “unnecessary or pernicious,” nor yet “likely to be productive of painful heart burning and serious divisions” in that body, that congregation had been in the habit of using the “unclean thing” and was then using it, when through its office-bearers application was made by it for admission. The Presbytery of Hamilton, (members of which were at the last Synod,) received that congregation, but before doing so made *an express agreement that the musical instrument should be allowed to remain, and to be used in the public service on the Lord's Day*. The Synod ratified that agreement, and that congregation was regularly enrolled on the Synod's Books. The congregation of Knox Church, not being one only seeking admission for the first time to the Canada Presbyterian Church, but being, on the contrary, one of the oldest congregations in the body, its case was treated differently. It was refused permission to continue the use of an instrument introduced and retained by the unanimous wish of the congregation. Mr. Inglis, who supported the motion to order the silencing of the organ in Knox Church, was one of the members of the Presbytery of Hamilton, by which the “unhallowed bargain” (if the decision in Knox Church case be correct) was accomplished. But there is no need to talk of individual members. The Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church has either sinned grievously in receiving a church, which had been and intended to continue in a course of

wrong doing, or it has sinned grievously in needlessly, recklessly, and without just cause, ordering the removal of a means of praising God in a more comely and orderly manner, disturbing the peace of a united, energetic, and working congregation, for a senseless freak, and introducing the element of discord into the discussions of a church court, which should have met for holier and higher aims than the occupying itself, to the almost entire exclusion of every thing else, in legislating for mere non-essentials. If the last decision be correct, then the first was given from a desire for an appearance of strength, without respect to principle, and in no way differed from the sin of Achan, when he desired and took possession of the "goodly Babylonish garment;" or the disobedience of Saul, when he spared the best of the spoil taken from Agag, and when reproved by Samuel, said he had done so to sacrifice to God. If the decision in the Knox Church case be right, then through covetousness the Synod grasped at another house to bring in more money to the treasury, under pretence of regard for the honour of their Master, saying they have performed the Commandment of God. Will we not be tempted while listening to these men, faithless by their own showing, to their own convictions, to say as their words of protestation rise on our ears: What meaneth this bleating of the sheep in mine ears, and the lowing of the oxen which I hear? Is this a mere question of longitude? Is that right in the West which is wrong in the East? If it be lawful to admit of a congregation from another body continuing to use an organ after it has joined itself to us, can it be unlawful to allow an old, nay the oldest congregation of our church, to continue to use an organ against which not a single complaint had been made? Is this trifling with convictions likely to do good to religion? Is this yielding of principle, or at least the profession of it, to the petty expediency of welcoming another charge, from the miserable motive of being able to boast of additions to our congregations, and an increase to numbers, likely to produce respect for those who practice such things, or for the religion which they teach? Will plain, honest, simple, and sincere men be deceived by the "twaddle," (we can find no more appropriate word) which has been uttered during the interminable discussions on this subject, by which our Church Courts have been disgraced, when they see a decision given in one case so diametrically opposite to that which has been given in another? Will these men not say: A congregation was admitted, having, and being allowed to keep, an organ in use, because without that condition it would not have joined the Canada Presbyterian Church, while another was refused the right to adopt the same means of leading the service of praise, because the Synod thought that no matter how the rights of the congregation were trampled upon, it would not dare to defend its own liberties of conscience, or to withdraw from its connection, if these could no longer be maintained inviolate?

We come now to the judgment in the appeal brought by the Rev. Dr. Irvine against the decision of the Presbytery of Montreal, in proceedings connected with this case. The judgment then given was so clearly illegal, irregular, and unconstitutional, that it is wonderful the members of Synod who composed the majority on that occasion have ventured to defend their course. Yet by special pleading, by gross misrepresentations, and by a studied perversion and concealment of facts, they have tried to make the worse appear the better reason. The attempt is made to show that the congregation had full notice of the steps that were about to be taken, and were represented for their interest. That this is most grossly incorrect is easily proved. It was determined at Toronto that the matter should be brought before the Synod and decided upon. The appeal involved the rights of—1st, the Minister in his own person; 2nd, the Kirk Session, (who, technically, were represented by the Moderator, but whose representative ruling elder was neither cited nor had notice given him); and 3rd, the congregation. It was decided at night, that the appeal of Dr. Irvine should be proceeded with next morning. No citation was served upon the congregation, nor could one have been available in the short time allowed. Words have no meaning if the congregation is not a party interested, and as such entitled to be

heard, and in point of fact always has been heard, where its special interests were concerned. No one but a stickler for the Divine right of a *caste*, set apart and consecrated to rule with an iron rod over the sheep of which they are pastors, and by whom their voice must be implicitly obeyed, would venture to say that a body of men could be tried, condemned, and sentenced, without an opportunity of saying one word. The justice or injustice of the sentence is not at this moment the question; the partiality or impartiality of the proceedings does not affect the matter. Had it been as fair and impartial as it was clearly the reverse in the eyes of all thinking men, not blinded by a theory of unreflecting obedience, the illegality of sentencing men in their absence would not be altered. This alone was sufficient to vitiate the whole proceedings, and taking our stand upon this point, we say decidedly that decisions so illegally arrived at and so unjustly pronounced, are neither valid nor binding. The sentence of the court was announced to the congregation, who were almost unanimous in resolving to refuse obedience to its behests. At a meeting specially announced, and held at the close of the regular prayer meeting, the question was brought up. On that occasion the Rev. Dr. Irvine stated that if the congregation refused to obey the orders of the Synod, he would in all probability be "stripped of his gown, and be forced to resign." This declaration of course had immense weight with the members present, yet at the close of the discussion, only a majority of two were found in favour of yielding to the illegal decision of the Synod. But at a subsequent meeting at which the congregation was fully represented, and after an earnest discussion, the motion was reconsidered, and the congregation came to the resolution to resume the use of the organ, believing the decision of the Synod to be illegal. Having thus asserted their opinion, and maintained their legal rights, the further resolution was passed, that under the circumstances, and in consideration of the feelings of those who might have conscientious scruples about entering into a controversy with the Synod, *even although they believed that court to be in the wrong*, the use of the instrument should not in the meantime be resumed.

We need not enter more fully in the preface into this subject. We believe it to have occupied far more of the time of church courts than is at all edifying. It is exactly one of the questions on which men of narrow and contracted views maintain a stand, which does harm to true religion and tends to bring it into contempt. In itself the use of the organ is not of essential importance, but the attempt to enforce a vexatious uniformity never contemplated by our Reforming fore-fathers, nor, which is of far more importance, by the Great Founder, Head and Lawgiver of the Church Universal, it was felt must be resisted, as being one step towards the establishment of an ecclesiastical tyranny, and worse than all, the tyranny of the ignorant over the more enlightened of their brethren.

THE ORGAN QUESTION

IN THE

CANADA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

LINE UPON LINE.

At a meeting of the congregation of Knox Church, Montreal, held on the 6th May, 1867, the following resolution was unanimously agreed to, on the motion of Mr. Alex. McGibbon, seconded by Mr. W. D. McLaren :—

1st. That singing to the praise of God has always been recognized as a part of worship in every Christian congregation, and that as true worshippers, every lawful means should be used to make this service, the only one in which Presbyterian congregations take an audible part, as perfect as possible.

2nd. That it has been found by experience that instrumental music wherever used under judicious regulations, has always tended to promote the harmonious and proper performance of this service, and to induce congregations more generally to join in singing to God's praise, as it is plainly their duty to do, and that the assistance of instrumental music for this purpose is not in contravention to, but on the contrary, is in entire consistency with the word of God.

3rd. That this congregation feeling convinced of the importance and necessity of instrumental aid in conducting the psalmody of the church, resolve to request the Presbytery of Montreal to transmit the following or such other overture as in their wisdom they may see fit, to the Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church to be holden at Toronto on Tuesday, the fourth day of June next, ensuing, viz :

Whereas, The question of instrumental aid in conducting the praises of God, is at present engaging the attention of the churches in the mother country and the British Colonies, and

Whereas, The time seems to have come when such aid is felt to be desirable by many of the congregations of the Canada Presbyterian Church : It is, therefore, respectfully overtured, that the Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church shall grant liberty to such congregations as may wish the same, to employ the aid of instrumental music in conducting divine worship in their churches.

4th. The Session of this church is respectfully requested to take the necessary steps to bring this Overture before the Presbytery at its first meeting, to be held in Erskine Church on Wednesday, the 8th of this month (May), 1867, with the view of having the same transmitted to the Synod in accordance with the rules of the Church.

To the Revd., the Presbytery of Montreal, in connection with the Canada Presbyterian Church in session convened :

We, the members of the Kirk Session of Knox Church, in the City of Montreal, most respectfully pray your Reverend Court to take into considera-

tion the foregoing resolution and overture appended, and to take such action thereanent as in your deliberative wisdom you may see fit, and as in duty bound your memorialists will ever pray.

(Signed)

R. IRVINE, D.D., Moderator.

E. MOORE, Session Clerk.

At MONTREAL, C. E., this 6th }
day of May, 1867 years. }

The following Commissioners were appointed to support the overture before the Superior Church Courts : Messrs. W. D. McLaren, W. McGibbon, James Brown, Andrew Wilson, John Ewart, and Alex. McGibbon.

On the 9th of May, 1867, the Presbytery of Montreal met to consider, among other subjects, the propriety of transmitting the memorial to the Synod. A considerable time having been occupied in useless discussion having no practical bearing,

Mr. REDPATH, Elder, rose, and said he thought the discussion was uncalled for. I have been waiting trying to hear something about the question really at issue, as I wish to understand what the question turns upon, but the whole time of the Court has been occupied by a dispute between two parties who do not understand each other. I remember a case in Glasgow in which a member of that Presbytery rose so often to speak that at last no one took the trouble to answer him, and after continuing to persevere for two years, he was at last glad to stop talking. Some of the members here seem not unlike that. The Presbytery have been occupied a whole day about a quarrel of no consequence, and twenty years from this these scenes will be looked back upon as absurd, and as a wasting of time, occupied to no purpose with petty quarrels. The rules of the Church have been appealed to, but there are some rules better not observed, and one of these has crept in under circumstances different from those in which we are now placed. Before twenty years organs will be in every Church in the Province.

Mr. GORDON : Is the question of organs before us ?

Mr. REDPATH : No, sir ; but I think you will be none the worse of having it brought before you. (Laughter.) I never sat so long at a meeting without having the proper business discussed that should come before it. A committee

of merchants, for instance, would be ashamed to sit wasting their time over such paltry quarrels for a whole day, and neglect the business which had brought them together. Whether you will or no, the question of organs will force itself upon you, and if you persist in refusing to give liberty to congregations to act in this matter as they may deem best, you may repent it when too late. If organs are not allowed to be used in churches before long, you will lose half of the congregations at least.

The memorial from Knox Church congregation was about to be read by the Clerk, when

Mr. GORDON wished to know what was in that paper ?

Mr. YOUNG : I am going to read it that you may see.

Mr. GORDON : You can't read anything till our matter is settled.

Mr. ALEX. MCGIBBON, Commissioner from the congregation, here stepped forward, and asked if it was in order that he should be heard now before the Presbytery on behalf of the congregation ?

After some little opposition by Mr. Gordon, the memorial was read.

Mr. GORDON moved that the papers lie on the table till the Committee's business be disposed of.

Mr. JOHN McLENNAN (Elder) seconded the motion.

Mr. ALLAN moved that the Commissioners be heard.

Dr. IRVINE seconded the amendment, and said the motion contained a most outrageous proposal, and if it was constitutional, by a parity of reasoning, any Christian congregation might be debarred from ordinances at the bidding of two or three men, who, for their impudence, had received a shower bath the other night.

Mr. REDPATH said this proceeding was most uncalled for. Here was a respectfully worded petition from a congregation, brought up in a respectful manner, and are they to be debarred from their right of petition in this way ?

After some further opposition by Mr. CAMERON, Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. GORDON,

Mr. WATSON moved that the petition and memorial be received, and the Commissioners from the congregation be heard, which was carried, and thereupon Mr. GORDON protested and appealed.

Mr. McLAREN, one of the Commissioners from the congregation, said: I am one of four individuals, who were appointed to represent the views of the congregation in this matter. I will not attempt to say if sufficient Scriptural grounds can be shown for the use of the organ having been disallowed in our branch of the Presbyterian family; but this much I will say, that having read and heard a good deal on both sides of the question, I think that the friends of the organ have decidedly the advantage of their opponents, so much so that I do not feel any conscientious scruples in confining myself entirely to the question of expediency. I am very much inclined to think that the organ was proscribed in the early days of the reformation from policy on the part of the leaders, who no doubt wished as much as possible to do away with everything that could remind the people of the pleasantest part of the worship under the system which had been done away with. It was necessary and proper, under the circumstances, that the leaders of the people should, in those days, have acted as they did, for it is probable that the prejudice in favour of the organ at that time can be equalled only by a similar feeling which is entertained against it by certain parties at the present day. But, if expediency required its disuse then, it seems that the very same reason would indicate that the time has arrived for its re-introduction. No one will pretend that its use now is likely to be followed by the same consequences as were dreaded then. On the contrary, the want of instrumental music, by which the psalmody of our churches might be kept up to a respectable standard, has allowed it to fall into such an ill-condition that we are constantly hearing of one and another who has left us on account of the slovenly way in which this part of worship is conducted. Again, music is one of the allurements which are being used by Romanists to draw within reach of the voice of its preachers the youth of Protestant churches. If, as I believe, the organ cannot be prohibited on scriptural grounds, and if its use will tend to prevent the falling away from our communion, to other Protestant denominations who use the organ—not to speak of the Church of Rome—it surely becomes the duty of our Superior Courts to throw no obstacles in the way of its introduction by such congregations as may desire to do so.

Mr. ALEXANDER McGIBBON said, this subject is one which has been before different churches, and in which considerable discussion has taken place. The object of our

congregation has been to bring the matter before the Supreme Court for decision. The fact of our tabling that petition shows this to be so. I contend that we have not acted inconsistently with the laws of the church. I would like to ask if there is any difference between public worship in a congregation on week days and on Sundays? Other congregations in Montreal belonging to this Presbytery have organs in their churches, which they use on week days in public worship. Is there any more harm in using an organ in public worship on a Sunday than there is in using it on a week day? But the truth is, the Presbytery is afraid to deal with Cote Street, and Erskine and St. Joseph Street Churches, in addition to ours, as they think so many would be rather heavy for them, but they believe they could use our little church as a target to fire their shots at. The last time I was in this very place, the organ was used; I have been present at St. Joseph Street Church when an organ was used, in Cote Street I have seen an organ, and though I never heard it played, I have my suspicions it was not there as a mere ornament. The proper way would be to bring all before the Presbytery, and deal with them all alike. We have been recommended to bring the matter before the Synod, and many of the Upper Canada Ministers have informed me that they will vote in support of the proposition to give each congregation liberty to decide for itself. It must not be supposed that this is a new thing on the part of the congregation. Even before we left St. Gabriel Street, it was decided that we should have an organ in the new church; of course in a proper way. A place was prepared for it; each minister who it was thought likely would be a candidate for the vacant charge, was informed that it was intended there should be an organ, and no secret was made of it. I may explain how it was placed in the church. We had a small organ in the lecture room, which the children enjoyed so much in the Sabbath School, that a larger one was ordered, and this was placed in the church on a special occasion, with no intention of leaving it there; but so marked was the improvement, and so satisfied was the congregation, that it was decided to allow it to remain till the decision of the Synod could be obtained. This is the whole history of that part of the case, and I fail to see where we have done wrong in this matter. I would only say that the Presbytery should be very cautious in dealing with a matter which is a mere question of convenience, and which breaks no law either of morality or of propriety.

Mr. JAMES BROWN : I am not about to use any arguments in defence of the little instrument which has excited so much controversy. Nobody here can say that in that law which is placed above the laws of Presbytery, or Synod, or General Assembly—the law to be found in the grand old Bible—one word is to be found against the use of an organ in the worship of God. In that grand old Bible the command is given that we are to use musical instruments in the service of the Sanctuary ; that law we intend to obey, and to have an organ. An instrument was used in the Sabbath School at first, and the elders grumbled, but the children were delighted. Twenty or thirty members then contributed to buy a larger one—the first had been a gift—and it was decided to use it, for it was considered that it conduced to the more worthy service of praise, and if anything can bring us nearer the great I Am than prayer, it is praise. For this is a help, not a substitute for an intelligent rendering of praise, and we have found it to be so. Many here are against the organ, because they have never heard it. If they would come and hear the praise led by this means, they would scarcely hear the instrument, as it is nearly drowned by the voices. We have not gone against your church laws, unless these are against the laws of God in this matter. If they are then we have gone against them. We are positively enjoined to use musical instruments in praise, instead of being forbidden to do so. You will find these words in the last Psalm, and none can be more explicit : “ Praise him with the sound of the trumpet ; praise him with the psaltery and harp. Praise him with the timbrel and dance ; praise him with stringed instruments and organs.”

Mr. ALLAN thought if this course had been adopted first it would have saved trouble. He moved that the Presbytery transmit the overture.

Mr. JONES, (Brockville, who had been invited to deliberate with the Presbytery), said the Brockville people were of the same mind as those of Montreal. He would support the overture at the Synod, and numbers of others had told him they would do so also.

A long discussion ensued upon the effect of the formula signed by ministers and elders, by which they are required to “ maintain the purity of worship, as established and practiced,” the one party maintaining that any innovation of

this kind was a breach of the ordination vow, and the other, that according to this argument the custom of the precentor reading out the line should be continued, as the change was as daring an innovation then, as the present proposal is now, and that the collection taken up after the service in bags or boxes, instead of an elder standing at the brod with a pewter plate before him, was rank heresy.

The motion to transmit was ultimately carried by eleven to five.

IN THE SYNOD.

The Synod met in Toronto, on the 7th of June, 1867, when, on motion of Mr. KEMP, the Overture from Knox Church, Montreal,* was taken up, and having been read, the Commissioners were called upon to support it, which they did as follows :—

Mr. W. D. McLAREN, one of the Commissioners from Montreal, was called to the platform, and addressed the Synod as follows: In urging on your favourable attention the prayer of the overture now before you, it would be presumption in one holding the humble position I do in the church, to expect that anything I could say in the way of argument deduced from Scripture, would be new to those so well versed therein, as the members of this house are. I would remark that instrumental music had a clear and explicit recognition in the Old Testament, was never forbidden in the New, and I know of no passage of scripture that, unless to support a foregone conclusion, can be quoted against the use of its aid to guide, sustain, intensify and harmonise, the volume of Praise on the Sabbath day, and I trust that this reverend court will approach the subject with a determination to let no preconceived or prejudiced opinion interfere with the exercise of its judgment, in dealing with the matter on its own merits. The use of instrumental music seems to have been laid aside in the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, from the motive of expediency, if not from the less worthy one of sheer opposition to all the forms in use by Popery and Prelacy before Reformation times; and in what I have to say, I will speak only as to the expediency of its re-introduction, stating

*The terms of the Overture will be found in page 1,

in this regard what I know to be the feelings and sentiments, not only of the congregation which has sent up this overture, but which I have reason to know are participated in, and held extensively by members of other congregations of our body. This overture had its origin in what all will acknowledge to be a pious and laudable purpose, namely, that of improving the manner in which the musical part of Divine worship is rendered on the Sabbath day. It is very generally acknowledged, that improvement in this direction is urgently required in many of our congregations, and it is the settled conviction of those who have moved in this matter, that instrumental music would conduce greatly to the end in view. It is true that since the period of the Reformation, the voices of the people have alone been sanctioned by our church, as the medium of praise ; but in a matter such as this, where it is believed the restriction is entirely arbitrary, we claim the same right as did our reforming ancestors to alter, amend, set up, or annul, in all that pertains to the mere outward forms of worship. There is no such thing as rest in the whole universe ; change is the rule in all created things ; there is no possibility of standing still in church order and modes of worship, as far as they are of human origin, any more than in the manners and customs of the people ; and to illustrate the changes of sentiment on this very subject, if I am correctly informed, the mover in its Synod of the only motion of any consequence disallowing instrumental music in one of the bodies which compose this now united church, has since then, in the metropolis of Scotland, delivered a lecture advocating the use of the organ. The circumstances of the church now are widely different from those which obtained at the Reformation period ; men had not then been born and brought up under the teaching of Protestantism, and eventualities had to be guarded against, which could not possibly occur now when, at the distance of more than two centuries, many more generations have grown up, all nurtured in, and prejudiced in favour of the reformed faith. The fact that the organ was in use in the economy of that system, which it was the life work of the Reformers to destroy, sufficiently accounts for the tone of any expressions of opinion from them on this subject, which may have come down to us, and it is believed that the re-introduction of the organ, under proper regulations, would be attended by many good results. Instrumental aid in public worship is absolutely necessary, if our congregations are to maintain

themselves alongside of those of other Evangelical denominations. Music, at the present day, is cultivated in almost every family, so that a taste for good music has become very general. With an increased appreciation of the tasteful and true, has come a corresponding disgust, when people of refinement are obliged to listen to the wretched singing, which is confessedly the rule in most of our churches—no matter how solemn or devotional in sentiment may be the words, the musical rendering is generally of such a nature as in a great measure to destroy their effect. It is of vital importance to the church, that the doctrines she teaches be pure and sound, and it is of hardly less importance if she would have her teachings heard by the greatest possible number, that her forms of worship be not such as to repel any class of the people. If we believe, as I trust we all most firmly do, that the doctrine and form of government of our church, is the most perfect, and most in accordance with God's Word of any, then it is certainly our duty to use every fair means, to bring it under the notice of as many of our fellow creatures as possible. The young of our congregations especially, are liable to be lost to us from this cause, and it is they whom we should make it our study to retain. Again, it is unquestionable that solemn music, rightly rendered, has the effect of awakening a devotional feeling in the human mind, and of preparing it for the reception of the Truth. In order to the attainment of this in a promiscuous assembly like a congregation, where all are expected to join, to the best of their ability, in praising God, a sustaining and guiding power is requisite, which will blend the voices of all as one loud acclaim. That this desideratum can only be found in instrumental aid must be clear to all who have given their attention to the matter, and if adherence to severe forms of worship, however well suited to the age in which they originated, is now working injury to the church, by preventing her from taking advantage of those means and appliances, which the advance of science and art has placed at her disposal, why should there be any hesitation about remodelling them to suit the circumstances of the people of to-day? If church-goers were all converted persons, who attended places of worship solely for the purpose of giving expression to the feelings of their hearts towards their Maker and Redeemer, it would matter little whether they could make what is called good music or not; if they were sincere in doing the best they could, it would be acceptable to God; but we must take things as we

find them ; congregations are in general largely composed of unconverted persons, and if one of the great objects of preaching the Gospel—if not *the* great object—be the conversion of sinners, who may be either of our own families, or the stranger within our gates, we must take care not to repel, but to attract them to our services, using all lawful means for that purpose. Is it then the part of true Christians to object to the use of instrumental aid in singing God's praises which, although not necessary to themselves, would be the means of drawing fellow sinners to the House of God, and when there, preparing their minds to some extent for the reception of the truth. As I have reason to know that those who are to follow will be likely to do the subject more justice than I can hope to do, I will not longer take up the time of this Reverend Court, and will close by asking you to entertain favourably an overture which is bound up with so much that pertains to the Church's welfare.

Mr. ALEXANDER McGIBBON, one of the Commissioners from Knox Congregation, Montreal, spoke as follows in support of the overture. He said : Mr. Moderator,—The subject which we have the honour to bring before the notice of your Reverend Court at this time is—as the overture expresses it, “That congregations under the jurisdiction of this Synod, be granted liberty of introducing the aid of instrumental music in the worship of God.” As it is a question that interests a great number of the members of the Canada Presbyterian Church, I should have liked that its advocacy, at this time, had been placed in abler hands, but my colleagues and myself having been chosen by the unanimous voice of the congregation we have the honour to represent, we felt that we could not decline—the more so as we feel a deep personal interest in the matter ourselves. We came too, Sir, all the more readily, knowing as we do, that we carry with us, not only the unanimous wishes of the members of Knox Church Congregation, but also those of a large and influential number of the members of other congregations in Montreal, and throughout Canada. A still stronger reason, Sir, has actuated us in presuming to appear before you to-day, in support of this overture just read, and it is this ; we conscientiously believe that the interests of our church and the cause of religion demand at this time, some such action as we have taken. It is therefore with considerable diffidence that we venture to address you on such an important subject, and should the subject not get

that justice from us which it deserves, we will nevertheless be conscious of having done our best. The resolution of the congregation of Knox Church says, that singing to the praise of God, has always been recognized as a part of worship in every Christian congregation, and that every lawful means should be used to make it as perfect as possible. It being the only portion of service in the Presbyterian Churches, in which the people take an audible part, you will admit that it necessarily interests them to a greater extent, than it possibly can the minister, who performs all the other duties himself, and as it is the duty of the people to join in the service of praise, it is also their duty to make it one of the most pleasing and profitable parts of worship, instead of having it, as is very often the case, one of the most offensive. The question then is, how is this service to be improved? Efforts are continually being made to raise the standard of vocal praise, but so far all such efforts have been unsuccessful. Up to this day no plan has been adopted to meet this great want. Singing to-day in our churches, is no better than it was thirty years ago, in fact if there is any change it is for the worse. As an example of this, I would mention that in one of our oldest Presbyterian Churches in Montreal, on a late occasion, the minister preached a sermon on the attitude of worship, and recommended standing instead of sitting during the service of praise. By way of example he asked them to sing the doxology standing, and to show to the world that they did not require instrumental music. The attempt was made, and they broke down three times in the effort to sing a simple doxology. This church used to be famed at one time for good singing; but like many others, those who have a taste for singing have all left. This is not to be wondered at, when one looks fairly at the question. It is useless to expect that when congregations are continually changing—people coming, and others going, that singing can be properly conducted under the present plan. No matter how gifted the precentor or leader may be, he cannot drag the voices of a whole congregation, into anything like time or harmony, far less of melody, and the consequence is that this part of public worship, which should be the most solemn and sublime, is looked upon as an annoyance by a great many who would otherwise like to join in the praise. A great number, therefore, now-a-days wend their way to church more to hear and criticise the sermon, than to worship God. The people in this way feel a want of interest, and this I am convinced accounts for so many,

especially the young, leaving the Presbyterian communion. We take the ground, therefore, that the experience of the past, is quite sufficient to prove that the present system of conducting the psalmody of the church, is not calculated ever to give any hope of improvement. It has been tried for nearly three hundred years, and the result is a complete failure. On the other hand, experience shows us that instrumental music, wherever used under judicious management, has always tended to increase the interest of the people in the service of praise, and to cause them more generally to join in singing themselves. It requires no argument of mine to prove this. We have but to enter a place of worship where instrumental music is used as an aid to, and not a substitute for the human voice, and observe the contrast, and if not blinded by prejudice and void of all taste, we cannot but be impressed with the beauty, the solemnity, and devotional feeling excited and awakened by the one service, as compared with the miserable and drawling efforts in the other. The objection raised by those who really should know better is, that it is not singing with the heart to use instrumental music; that the piety of the people who have to adopt such means must be at a low ebb, and that its tendency is to lead our people into ritualistic practices, and possibly to draw them to the Church of Rome. To the first of these objections I would say, that singing with the heart, making melody unto the Lord, does not necessarily imply, that we should sing badly. On the contrary, I am more inclined to the belief that we can all join more heartily, and praise God more devoutly—making melody in our hearts—when the service is properly and decently performed, than we can possibly do when it is gone through in a slovenly, careless, and offensive manner. To the second objection I would answer by asking, Is the piety of the churches who use instrumental music of a lower or higher order than that of the Canada Presbyterian Church? Will any one say that the piety of the Baptist, Independent, Methodist, and American Presbyterian Churches, is less than that of ours? I think no one can take such ground. Judging from the city of Montreal, where I am better acquainted with the facts, where will you find a more faithful, vigorous and pious people, than compose these churches I have mentioned. They are foremost in every good work, each one vies with the other as to who will accomplish most good, in training the young, in supporting our public charities, in establishing mission schools and

churches, and advancing the cause of Christ generally both at home and abroad. We as a church who by implication, put ourselves on a higher level of Christianity, might with very great propriety, imitate their noble example in many of these things. As to the ritualistic and Romish tendencies I would ask again—are those churches I have named, viz : the Baptists, the Independents, the Methodists, and the American Presbyterians, less Protestant than we are ? Such arguments I hold to be childish, and scarcely deserving of notice. Facts can be given to prove that by *not* using the aid of instrumental music, we are actually, and on this very ground, driving many of our people both old and young into ritualism, and into the church of Rome. I will not go into the question at length on scriptural grounds, for I believe it has been settled long ago that scripture is altogether in our favour, and therefore to attempt to say it is contrary to scripture is so absurd, that those who hold such views, must be supposed to know very little of what the word of God really says on the subject. I cannot find in the Bible, which is our highest authority, one word from beginning to end against instrumental music. On the contrary, I find much in its favour. Our blessed Lord never condemned its use, neither did his disciples, and when we find them so minute on matters of less importance than this, and giving in detail so many things to be avoided, we must come to the conclusion that had this practice been a bad one, it too would have been pointed out as such. The Psalmist David sang his songs with the aid of a harp and other instruments, and surely there can be no impropriety in following his example. We sing his Psalms, and why not use the aids he used ? Can it be affirmed that the praise that David offered to Almighty God, was less acceptable, because he brought into requisition and made use of all available and legitimate aids ? I am inclined rather to the belief that his praise was heightened, and that he joined in it with far more fervour, feeling, and true devotion, with such aids, than he could possibly have done with the mere human voice, or else he would not have given so much prominence to the use of instrumental music, as he does in such language as this : “Let us make a joyful noise to the Rock of our Salvation.” “Let us come before His presence with thanksgiving, and make a joyful noise unto Him with Psalms.” “Make a joyful noise unto the Lord all ye lands.” “Enter into His gates with thanksgiving, and into His Courts with praise.” “O that men would praise the Lord for His

goodness." "Praise ye the Lord ; praise Him in the firmament of His power." "Praise Him with the sound of the trumpet." "Praise Him with the psaltery and harp." "Praise Him with the timbrel and dance." "Praise Him with stringed instruments and organs." "Praise Him upon the loud cymbals." "Praise Him upon the high sounding cymbals." "Let everything that hath breath praise the Lord." "I will praise the Lord with my whole heart in the assembly of the upright, and in the Congregation." What other meaning can be given to such language as this, than that instrumental music is not only allowable, but positively commanded? It is plain that no principle is involved in the use of instruments in the worship of God, and this being the case it is surely the duty of this Synod to grant congregations full liberty to employ the same, if they see fit. It is no innovation in the object of our worship, we sing the same psalms—same paraphrases, same hymns—we all worship the same God through the one and only Mediator—what we want and what we ask for is, a help, a support to the voices of the people, so that they may sing with unity of voice, and that the service may be conducted more steadily, more uniformly, and more seemly, and thus heighten devout feelings, whilst it prevents that discord and confusion which so often distract the attention of worshippers and mar the whole public service. Referring to the laws and usages of the church as contained in the Confession of Faith and Books of Forms, I find nothing in these books against instrumental music. It is plain when the Confession was compiled very little attention was given to the subject of praise. Page upon page is given directing how the prayers are to be conducted ; rules are laid down for preaching, for marriage, for baptism, for visiting the sick, for fast days and other matters, but it seems the public praise was almost entirely omitted, for we find on the last page but a few words on the subject. That sentence says that the line is to be read by the minister or some other fit person appointed by him and the other ruling officers ; and the reason given for this mode of action is that the people being ignorant cannot read for themselves. No doubt this was the best arrangement that could be adopted at the time, but it is evident the compilers of that book thought it best to say as little as possible as to the style and manner of singing, leaving these to be altered according to the circumstances of the times. Doubtless the reading of the line may be suitable in some places to this day. I dare say the practice is still continued in newly

settled districts, or even in parts of Canada remote from educational advantages, and where consequently the people may require such assistance ; and so long as they need this help, and are satisfied with it, by all means allow them to adopt the manner best suited to their circumstances. What we contend for is liberty of action in non-essential matters. If strict uniformity is insisted on, then the reading of the line must at once be ordered to be discontinued. This has never been asked. Where the reading of the line is useful let it be continued, but congregations who use a different method surely ought to be allowed to adopt it without the interference of those who take a different course. So long as the matter is the same, it is of less importance as to the manner. Indeed congregations have more liberty now as to what they shall sing than they have as to the manner of singing. Some use only the psalms, others use psalms, paraphrases and hymns. It can be shown that the church has departed in many instances from the old customs and forms as laid down in the Confession of Faith and in the directions for public worship. I will mention a few to show that as circumstances arose from time to time these customs and forms had a wide berth given them. The custom of reading the line is one that has almost ceased to exist. Celebrating the Lord's Supper with only one table instead of several is another. Introducing prayers, reading and singing at funerals, on the other hand, have crept in, and is a most outrageous innovation, because the Confession distinctly says that the dead body is to be taken from the house to the place of burial without any ceremony, and that praying, reading or singing at or around the dead body is superstitious, and must be laid aside. What is the case now ? We have reading, praying and singing at funerals, and often they are held in Presbyterian churches with a great deal of pomp and ceremony. The Confession says that the ordinance of baptism is not to be administered privately, but is to be done publicly in the face of the congregation ; now it is done privately every day. The rule laid down in the Confession as regards marriage is, that it is to be publicly solemnized in the place appointed by authority for public worship before a credible number of witnesses at some convenient hour of the day, and so on. This rule has been departed from to such an extent that now it is looked upon as an innovation to have the marriage ceremony performed in a Presbyterian church. Here then are written laws which still stand on the statute book unrepealed, and yet in respect to which the church has had to

accommodate itself to the wishes of the people. The same arguments that are used against the use of instrumental music might be urged against the introduction of Sabbath schools for the children. They are not sanctioned by the directory of public worship; on the contrary, they are, inferentially at least, forbidden. I will read the passage in full, as it will show that we cannot rely upon these directions exclusively for our guidance, nor was it intended by the framers of the laws regulating our worship that we should. The words are, that "what time is vacant between or after the solemn meeting of the congregation in public, be spent in reading, meditation, repetition of sermons, especially by calling their families to an account of what they have heard, and catechising of them, holy conference, prayer for a blessing upon the public ordinances, singing of psalms, visiting the sick, relieving the poor, and such like duties of piety, charity and mercy, accounting the Sabbath a delight." Here there is not only no mention made of Sabbath schools, but, on the contrary, the heads of families are enjoined themselves to call their families round them for catechising, instruction, &c. When Sabbath schools were originated, was not the innovation as great as the introduction of musical instruments? I believe it was greater. Has it not been said, with a great show of reason, that the duties enjoined on parents would be neglected, and that the Sabbath school teachers would perform it in their stead, just as it is said now that the organ will supersede congregational singing and be adopted in its stead? Has it not been said that the Sabbath school would do away with the solemn household duties in which parents and children alike took part on the Sabbath afternoon? Were not objections almost without number brought against them which many in this court may well recollect? Is it not true that many do neglect the domestic training of their children, because they trust it to the teacher? And it is not unlikely, for it is true also, that the organ has been in like manner abused—that I will not deny. But because there is abuse in these things, must we therefore give up their use? No man will be bold enough to stand up and say that Sabbath schools are not a help, a very great help, and nursery to the church, and that they should be abolished because some have made them a cloak for their own indifference. And in a very few years the man who will advocate the removal of musical instruments as an aid to worship will be just as rare—will, in fact be undiscoverable. We are told that the office-bearers who

adopt instrumental music in the churches over which they are placed are violating their ordination vows. I think I have shown that whilst there is nothing binding as regards instrumental music in any of the laws or rules of the church, that the obligations of those who wish to adhere strictly to these laws and rules of the Confession of Faith and directory are most flagrantly violated in the matters of baptism, of marriage, of burials, of training the young ; and the same thing can be said of fast days, of celebrating the Lord's Supper, and conducting other parts of public worship. This being the case, we think the time has arrived when a similar latitude may with very great advantage be allowed in the manner of public praise. The universal cry from the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, England, Ireland, and in the British Colonies, is, that they lose the young people ; they have no hold on them as they grow old enough to judge for themselves. How is it that the Episcopal Church is gaining such a firm footing, even in Presbyterian Scotland ? Just because the services of the majority of Presbyterian Churches are conducted in such a way as to repel people rather than attract and retain them. I will read an extract from a letter which appeared in the *Record* of our Church for June, 1866. The letter is dated from New Zealand, and is signed by the Rev. John Hall. He says : " We have not held our own in the cities, especially in Auckland. On the contrary, we have lost hundreds of families. Indeed, it appears to me that no church loses more in proportion to its numbers than we do ; a most uncomfortable reflection, and one which I should suppress did I not believe that something might be done to make our form of public worship more attractive to people of cultivated musical taste. We have become antiquated and singular in our service of song, till our children of more refined musical taste have been attracted by the choral services of other churches." Your own reports state the same thing year after year, and we have precisely the very same difficulty staring us in the face every day, where whole families have been actually driven out of the Presbyterian Church by the antiquated and singular form of our service of song. I would ask, is there no remedy that can be applied to meet this great evil ? How is it that other churches interest their people and we cannot ? How is it they attract the young, and we drive them away ? It is not the fault of the preaching, for I believe we have as faithful preaching in the Presbyterian Church as in any other. Our form of church government is as scriptural as any other, and our

doctrines are as sound and pure ; how then does it come that so many Presbyterians are filling the pews of other churches ? The reason almost invariably given by those who have left us is, that they were satisfied with the preaching, doctrines, and government of the Presbyterian Church, but they could not stand the singing, and they saw little hope of improvement ; and partly on their own account, but chiefly on account of their families, they left and joined a church where they and their children could alike be interested and edified in all the departments of public worship. To meet this difficulty to a certain extent a number of the Canada Presbyterian churches have regularly in use in their Sabbath schools instrumental music, but unless the same be introduced into the congregational singing, the evil is only aggravated, for the scripture proverb which says, " Train up a child in the way he shall go, and when he is old he will not depart from it," will bear its fruit in this as in other respects, for if the children are trained to the use of instrumental music when they are young, rest assured they will not depart from it when they are old. The congregations who thus act are plainly admitting the advantages of instrumental music as an aid, whether their representatives here to-day will vote or will not vote in support of the overture, for if it is necessary as an aid to the young, it is as necessary as an aid to the old. You may therefore expect that if the difficulty is not met in some shape or other, that not individuals only, nor families, but whole sections of the people will leave your communion. Some object on the ground that if instrumental music be permitted, the consciences of those opposed to it will be offended ; on the other hand, the consciences of those in its favour will be greatly hurt if it be not permitted. What is the grand object the church has in view ? Is it not the salvation of souls to Christ and the edification of the people ? Her great commission is—to preach the gospel to every creature. How is this to be accomplished ? One way is to bring the people under the influence and sound of the truth, and for this end all proper means should be used by the church. If the seemly service of praise will attract and keep the people, and bad music drive them away, then by all means let us have the good music. I hold that the Presbyterian Church in neglecting to make use of this help—this aid—is allowing a stumbling-block to lie in the way of the great work given her to do. We ask nothing unreasonable. We wish to impose nothing on any congregation against its will. All

we ask is liberty to judge for ourselves as to how we shall worship God in the department of public praise. But, Mr. Moderator, there is something more to be considered than the use or disuse of instrumental music in this question. Our fathers contended for freedom of thought and liberty of opinion, regulated by the Word of God, and in obedience to its dictates. If a usage was begun in the Presbyterian Church under circumstances which rendered it expedient, and was continued as long as these circumstances seemed to demand, are we therefore to be compelled when the necessity has passed away to remain bound by acts which were called forth by the times in which they originated, and which had a noble end and aim, but were neither supported nor defended as being enjoined by the laws of God. To hold that is simply to assume the cast-off robes of the Pharisees, who held the traditions of men as superior to the Word of God. Upon that Word we take our stand. Prove from it that what we ask is unlawful and opposed to its commands, and, speaking for myself and, I venture to say, for the whole of the congregation I represent, I will, from henceforth, however expedient I may believe it to be, never again ask this court to sanction such a practice. But feeling as I do, taking my ground on the faith of our Protestant forefathers, who protested against yielding their reason up blindfold to the dictates of a church which sought to stifle all discussion under the weight of authority, I must be shown not mere assumption but conclusive proof from the authority which we all acknowledge as our sole rule and guide. To come to the special case of Knox congregation, I may be permitted to remark that we placed a small instrument in the church for a public missionary meeting, and it gave such universal satisfaction that it was thought wise to leave it there, providing the congregation were unanimous in its favour, until the approval of the Synod might be obtained. The improvement in our public singing is so great that a few who were opposed to it at first are now the strongest in its favour. The people all join in the service of praise with a heartiness and a will never before experienced by us as a congregation. The same thing can be said with the Sabbath school. We are accused by some as acting in opposition to and in defiance of the authority of the church ; we deny this most emphatically. After we have tried the experiment for ourselves, we have come here to-day, the first opportunity we have had, to ask permission to continue it. On a matter of such importance to the congregation, in which there is not

a dissenting voice, we preferred to have the mind of the highest court expressed on the subject, as we are aware that a large and influential number of the members of this Synod know better than we do the advantages of instrumental music; and whatever decision you may come to, doubtless it will be complied with by the congregation we represent. We contend we have done nothing amiss in this matter. The Synod has already received, if I am correctly informed, into its communion in the Presbytery of Hamilton, a congregation in which a musical instrument is regularly used. The Synod surely has not one rule for the Presbytery of Hamilton and another for that of Montreal. Taking all these things into consideration, we, as a congregation, feel that we have been subjected to grievous interference by both ministers and laymen from the country districts, whose conduct and language, as expressed on different occasions, against us, have been, to use the mildest term, most gross and offensive. It is well known throughout the bounds of the Presbytery of Montreal that a more peaceful, prosperous, and harmonious congregation is not in the Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church at this moment, and surely we will not appeal in vain to you to-day for protection from such painful and unwarrantable interference, or, I might more properly say, high handed tyranny, of parties residing in districts distant from us. What would the Glengarry congregations think of a deputation going up from Montreal and interfering with their manner of public worship? They would certainly think they were interfered with. We think so too, and I would humbly submit that such interference is at variance with the general rules of the church, which enjoin on presbyteries the necessity of fostering and promoting peace and harmony among the various congregations under their care. In this instance no complaint was laid before them by any of our congregation, and surely it was quite time enough for parties to give their advice and counsel when it was asked. A good deal has been written and said lately about our progress as a church. It would be out of place for me to venture an opinion on the subject, but this I will say: we, as a church, are too much inclined to be satisfied with things as they are; we are not acting enough on the aggressive. Our church has barely held its own in many of the cities and towns, whilst many of our country stations have been snatched out of our hands by other and more active denominations. If you want your home missionary schemes better supported, if you want your colleges placed

on firm and permanent foundations, and to occupy a front rank among the institutions of learning, and if you want the ministry supported as they ought to be, get the people more interested, remove all obstacles which seem to stand in the way to hinder the general prosperity of our church. One of these obstacles, we think, is the subject which we have endeavoured to bring under your notice at this time. And now, Mr. Moderator, we leave the question in the hands of this court, trusting that it will be carefully and impartially considered, and that you may be guided with wisdom from on high, which alone can enable you to arrive at a proper conclusion ; and whatever that conclusion may be, let us all pray that it may redound to the glory of Christ, the interests of His church, and the advancement of His kingdom throughout that portion of the Dominion of Canada over which this Synod has jurisdiction. Before sitting down Mr. McGibbon asked the permission of the moderator to make an explanation regarding a statement made in the forenoon by a member of the synod. The permission was granted. Mr. McGibbon said that a member had stated that Knox congregation would refuse to pay their subscription of \$2,000 to the college if the organ was ordered out of the church. This was a mistake. Whatever they had promised to pay, he knew they were honourable enough to pay the last cent of it, whether the organ was allowed or disallowed. This he would say, however, that had they not been subjected to such annoyances, instead of their subscription being \$2,000, it would have been nearer \$5,000.

Mr. JAS. BROWN, also a lay delegate from Montreal, then rose and spoke as follows :—Mr. Moderator—At the request of the congregation of Knox Church, Montreal, I appear before you to urge the granting of the prayer of their petition. Anxious to get the strongest arguments in its favour, I turned at once to the Word of God, and found them written on many a page ; but for me to go over ground that will be so ably taken up by others would be a task of supererogation, and it seems strange that business men should even require to come before this august body on such an errand, irksome and unusual to men in our position. But we have a duty to perform ; let us strive to do it honestly and in Christian charity towards those who may differ from us on this question. We believe that in granting this petition you would violate none of the laws of the church ; were it otherwise a higher law than that of the church courts would be

broken by the laws of men being placed above the laws of God. As individuals, and as a congregation, we have no wish to set at nought or disregard the pleasing duties laid upon us, or to think lightly of the privileges secured to us by that higher law. It is the right of every Christian to read that Bible for himself, and to worship the Creator according to the dictates of his conscience, and that worship, the Redeemer tells us, "must be in spirit and in truth." We believe the aid of an organ will not hinder our conforming to this requirement. To man alone above all the works of His hands has the capacity to worship and adore been vouchsafed by the Creator. With more understanding than the beasts that perish, we feel the impress and superscription of Him who has stamped us with this religious sentiment, and given to us the power of language that we may call Him "Our Father," or gladly sing His praise. Surely, then, with such attributes, it is our duty, no less than our privilege, to search that Bible and learn how we can best serve Him, and what that worship requires. We believe then that we are commanded to "sing unto the Lord a new song" and "to praise him with the psaltery and harp," and we believe that instrumental music, as an aid, and kept in its proper place, will conduce to the more worthy rendering of that praise, and the solemn strains of the organ are the best suited for that purpose. We know it, for we have felt it; we believe it is not contrary to the word of God. But I may be met with my own argument, that we are at liberty to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience, and whilst we prefer the organ, others might choose a very different instrument. I grant the objection is perfectly valid, but we arrogate no privileges to ourselves which we do not concede to others, and we throw them back for their authority on that old Bible, and if they are earnest in their search and choice of an instrument, the sacrifice of praise which they render will not be far from being accepted. But I go farther: when they can bring us that instrument that combines in the sweep of its octaves a power that will cast a more hallowing influence over the soul in lifting it higher and nearer the great I AM, and blends in its swell more harmoniously the compass of the voices of the worshippers, we will let the organ go. We can remember when we regarded that organ with pious horror, and we can sympathise still with any in similar straits; and if by stealth in these early days we went from the church of our fathers to hear it, we felt as if we had an additional sin to confess. But that day has gone. In

the journey of life we have been thrown into circumstances that compelled our hearing it, and we have learned that it is not such a deadly sin to seize its powerful aid in raising us nearer and closer to Jehovah, for the worship that he requires can only be rendered by the soul to him, and it is no sacrifice of thanksgiving or of praise if the worshipper delegates that high privilege to the loudest organ or the loudest song, and his heart not right. It must be a song with the spirit and with the understanding also. We believe it is possible to render this homage. One of those circumstances to which I refer of being compelled to hear it was this. Many years ago I had crossed the Atlantic and arrived in Liverpool on a Sabbath morning, and I asked a person I met to show me to a dissenting church. He directed me to the Rev. H. Stowell Brown, and as I entered and was shown to a seat, that vast congregation arose, and, along with the organ, commenced to sing that grand song, "O come let us sing unto the Lord, let us heartily rejoice in the strength of our salvation," and then the words farther on, "for the sea is His and He made it, and His hands formed the dry land ; O come let us worship and fall down and kneel before the Lord our maker." I remember that song still, and am not ashamed to confess that, as instinctively I joined in that song of praise, the cobwebs of my early prejudices were given to the winds, and I do not wish them again respun. But public opinion and prejudices have undergone a mighty change since then—fifteen years ago—and if, instead of those who now sit in judgment on this overture, the congregations you represent were to decide, I believe it would be carried by an overwhelming majority. We have had a sort of religious dread of approaching this question, a dread that we might fall into the hands of the session, of the presbytery, or the synod ; but if we are right in regard to the ground we take in making our petition, we ought not to be afraid. And similar opportunities of hearing the organ have happened to our children with similar results. Every New Year's morning they muster at our several churches, and march to one large enough to hold them, and the Sabbath School Association of Montreal have dared to take them to churches that used the organ, have dared to select music and hymns suited to the joyous temperament of the little ones, have dared to make no compromise with customs contrary to reason and religion, and at each tune the band of little ones rise up that they may render on that New Year's morning a more reverend homage and a louder song. There are some

customs observed by the church that would be more honoured in the breach than in the observance. We are not prepared to tell our children it is unseemly to stand upright when singing the praises of the sanctuary, or that it is wrong to sing a new song like "Nearer my God to Thee, nearer to Thee," or to tell them the aid of the organ is forbidden in our Bible. Ten years ago, when this question was brought up in one of the presbyteries of our church, amongst other arguments advanced against the use of the organ there was this : that instrumental music in the church was like the deadly night shade, the taste of the leaf of which being so sweet, it would the more easily work the ruin and poison of the churches, and the vote went against the organ. Do you think that that vote has anything to do with the census of our church to-day ? Has the use of that instrument wrought the ruin of the churches which have adopted it ? Has the Baptist church been ruined by the introduction of that music ? Has the American Presbyterian church gone down by using it ? Have the Independents decreased by the use of the organ ? Are the Wesleyans less powerful for using instrumental music ? Has the roll of membership of the Methodist church decreased ? And is it not likely, think you, that in another ten years, if the Methodist church increases in the same ratio as it has done in the past through the length and breadth of the land, it will bid fair for being the church of the Dominion of Canada ? We believe no small share of its success is due to the more attractive character of its services, especially in weaning over the young. And looking to our children as the foundations of our future churches, for their sakes, too, I say, grant the petition of their fathers. The strongest argument against the organ being introduced into our church I heard more than a year ago by an office-bearer, and it was this : that it would cause division in the church, and many would leave it. I replied, "And where would they go to ?" "Go to," said he, "go right over to the Auld Kirk." That gentleman bore about equal love to the organ and the Auld Kirk. However, it was the only place he could send them to for refuge. But going right over to the Auld Kirk a year or so ago, as the only alternative, would not be quite so safe a place to seek refuge in to-day. Whatever we may have felt in that Auld Kirk in Scotland years ago, contrary to freedom of worship, it is marching up with the times here. Is the use of instrumental music commanded in the Bible ? and has the old church of our fathers in its highest courts decided its use is

neither against the laws of God nor man? We answer unhesitatingly yes ; and if division comes, it will but advance the interest of that cause and kingdom which the laws of men, framed in error or oppression, can never arrest, for past history declares the Ruler of All Events can make opposition subserve His own wise end. No, the divisions of burghers and anti-burghers, old light and new light, relief and secession, and last, but not least, of the Free and the Auld Kirk, never weakened the Church of God. Have no fear, then, that in granting our prayer you will weaken our church. Twenty-four years ago the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland met within the walls of St. Andrew's Church in Edinburgh. The royal commissioner presided over its sittings. You may say that church bore the royal arms, that its charter rights were secured under the Crown—rights and privileges that would have satisfied even the requirements of a Knox. In the eye of the law and of that church it was the right of the patron to fill the pulpit with a pastor of his choosing, not the right of the people to choose and fill their pulpits with a pastor of their own choice. Many good and loyal ministers and men believed there was a flaw in the charter rights of church and state, and that they were not bound to see through the short-sighted spectacles that fitted the nose of any patron. And there was some temporizing with the people, and they gave them a choice of two or three pair to keep them quiet. It would not do ; these good men and true insisted on the right of choice for themselves. To the beck and nod of any single patron in the land these ministers and congregations would not bow down ; these pastors threw themselves on the people and their God, and sacrificing the tribute money and their homes rather than their consciences and their freedom, ignored the superscription of the Cæsars. The principle involved in their case then—right of conscience—is the same that is involved in ours to-day. Twenty four years ago an honoured band, headed by such men as Welsh and Chalmers, Gordon and Cunningham, Candlish and Buchanan and Guthrie, laid a protest upon the table of that Assembly, and marched with uncovered heads from the walls where they were met, leaving behind charter rights of patrons and the Church of Scotland. But they brought away with them a charter older and more honoured far than that of Imperial Britain, and under it boldly proclaimed they were free. That charter which they brought with them was an open Bible. Though we are not the Free Church of

Scotland, we abide by the rights and privileges of that charter. It is equally well adapted for us now as then in our mother land, and lower than what its privileges have bequeathed to us we are not prepared to stoop. It is the heritage of the Canada Presbyterian Church to-day, and the prayer of our petition is based on no lower authority than the foundation of that Bible. Our children know nothing or little of the causes that led to that disruption, because these causes do not exist here, but should similar circumstances arise, what we did then they would do now—open up that old royal charter that has weathered many a storm, and inquire in its pages what its duties and what its privileges are. And in regard to this service, and the use of instrumental music in it, they will soon find out that as the offerings to the King of kings were to be the best of the flock, that as nothing impure, or maimed, or a weakling, was to be presented to Him, so they will take care that the sacrifices and offerings of the lips and of the heart which they bring are not of the lowest order, but in accordance with His word. Baptists, and Independents, and Wesleyans, and the Church of Scotland are setting us an example we need not be ashamed to follow; and while we would compel no one to do violence to his conscience, we would at the same time ask that no violence should be done to a unanimous congregation, unless it can be shown we are in error. The organ will do very well for us now as a church, and its solemn music will carry nothing of levity amongst us as worshippers, nor will its hallowing influences make us fall short of comprehending that it is not to the instrument we are to look for sanctifying that offering, but to the heart that is presenting that sacrifice. Surely as Presbyterians worthy of the name, we will not forget to whom that homage is to be rendered, nor that command, "Sing unto the Lord with the harp, with the song, and the voice of a psalm." The author of these words, when a youth in the tents of Jesse, struck the chord of that harp, nor did he forget the song or harp when he had reached a throne and was Israel's anointed King. We have asked you to sanction the use of instrumental music, but the day may come when our children will wonder that this was necessary, or why it was delayed so long, and we trust the most pleasant tasks they may have to learn will be Zion's music and Zion's songs. Ten years have passed away since a small congregation humbly craved what we are here to-day to plead for, and their petition was refused. Before another ten years have

passed away we may be gone, but there will be other pleaders in the field, and that little army now training in our Sabbath Schools, and in our homes, untrammelled by the prejudices of old Scotland, that army will alter the complexion of the battle, for many of them will fill the places you, their judges, occupy to-day. And they will have the strongholds and fortresses of the church in their possession, the hearths and hearts of the people. We do not wish to be uncharitable—leave it to the peoples choice—let it remain an open question. There is room enough and work enough in this Dominion of Canada for us all. Write not over our little Zion as the first act of your Synod on the birth-day of your nation—We forbid you to worship the God of your fathers according to the dictates of your conscience—we forbid you to use instrumental music in that worship—we place you under our bann. One word more, we come not here to argue this question on the ground of appearances or expediency, or because the Church of England, or the Church of Scotland, or any other church has introduced the organ. Our appeal is not to General Assemblies, or Synods, or Cæsar's tribunal, it is to that code we place above them all—to the Law and to the Testimony. Mr. Moderator—The eyes of thousands and tens of thousands are upon us this day, let no verdict be recorded more suitable to the dark ages, than the present time. I trust the Synod will listen to the voice of a united and flourishing congregation, and pursue the only honourable and upright course open, by granting the prayer of our petition.

It was moved by Mr. W. B. CLARK, of Quebec, seconded by Mr. JAMES WATSON :

“That permission be granted, meanwhile, to such Sessions and Congregations as are generally agreed on the subject, to avail themselves of the assistance of Instrumental Music in the Service of Praise; but that such Sessions and Congregations be enjoined to take order that no tunes be introduced but such as are plain and simple, and fitted for general congregational singing; and that the matter be sent down to Presbyteries in terms of the Barrier Act.”

The Rev. W. B. CLARK remarked that he would have liked if the question had come up unencumbered by the difficulties connected with Knox Church, Montreal. Still, that disadvantage was in a great measure counterbalanced by the very able manner in which the subject had been presented by the commissioners from Montreal. Their advocacy did honour to their ability, and it was creditable to the church that plain ordinary members could set forth and defend the

case as they had done. It is a principle of Presbyterianism, he continued, that nothing ought to be introduced into the worship of God unless we have the sanction of scripture for it—that the worship and discipline, as well as the doctrine of the church, ought to be regulated by the Word of God only. As Presbyterians, then, we ought to permit no regard to expediency, or to the taste, or opinions of men to sway us in consenting to introduce into the worship of God anything which has no sanction in His word. But if we are true to our principles, we ought to be just as zealous in permitting nothing to be excluded from the worship of God which is clearly sanctioned in His word. There is such a thing as attempting to be wise above what is written, as well as to be righteous overmuch ; and if, from an affectation of superior spirituality, we banish from the worship of God everything which appeals to the senses, even though sanctioned by His word, we are certain to suffer loss. And I believe that, from their opposition to the use of hymns suited to the existing state of things, and the assistance of instrumental music in the service of God, Presbyterians have lost much, and are still continuing to lose seriously, not only in numbers, but in something vastly more important. The question, then, for us to consider at present is simply this—Is the use of instrumental music in the service of God sanctioned in His word, or is it not? It will not be denied that the use of instrumental music in the worship of God was extensively used in the temple service, as arranged by men acting under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. But it will be replied that this was emblematical and ceremonial, and, having served its purpose, has passed away. It is admitted that all which was typical and figurative has passed away. But he would be a rash man who would say that everything that was practised in the temple service has passed away. Prayer, though constituting an important part of the temple service, has not passed away, and there is no reason why instrumental music, fitted as it is to guide and sustain the people's service of song and stir the innermost depths of the soul, should pass away. The ceremonial law of the Jews, having accomplished its purpose, has passed away, and so, to a large extent, has their municipal law ; but truth once revealed is for ever truth, and no change of circumstances can destroy its character. We believe that God employed the use of instrumental music in His service, not merely to direct and sustain the singers, but to impress and solemnize more deeply the mind, and to call forth more fully the

devotional feelings of the soul. And as human nature is still the same, music, as experience teaches us, produces the same effect still. In the 147th Psalm, which has nothing ceremonial about it, but which is purely moral and devotional, and in comparison of which the finest modern hymns and the grandest compositions of ancient times are but as the chaff to the wheat, in that noble psalm we have these words, "Sing unto the Lord with thanksgiving, sing praises upon the harp unto our God." Now, if the authority of this psalm is worth anything, it appears to me undeniable that scripture recommends us to avail ourselves of the assistance of instrumental music in the service of God. In the 3rd chapter of the Second Book of Kings we have a very striking illustration of the power of music in soothing and composing the mind, and preparing it for the reception of the spirit of God. The mind of Elisha appears to have been dark and discomposed when he saw Jehoshaphat, the King of Judah, associated with the son of Ahab and Jezebel, and when asked to enquire of the Lord for them, after indignantly addressing the son of Jezebel, and declaring that had it not been for the presence of Jehoshaphat he would not have looked towards him nor seen him, he said—"But now bring me a minstrel. And it came to pass when the minstrel played that the hand of the Lord came upon him." Now, if the power of music thus soothed and composed the mind of the prophet, and prepared him for the reception of the spirit of God, ought such assistance to be refused by us who stand fully as much in need of it as he did? And if the power of music produced such an effect upon an individual, it is equally fitted to produce the same effect upon a multitude; and hence you may see the folly of refusing to avail ourselves of the power of music in the public worship of God. But it may be said that all this took place in Old Testament times, and that we have no sanction for the use of instrumental music in the service of God in the New Testament. To this I would reply—Is there anything in the New Testament prohibiting the use of instrumental music in the worship of God? I know of nothing. But I know of one passage in the New Testament where the use of instrumental music in accompanying the voices of God's worshippers is very plainly recognized. When the apostle John obtained a glimpse of what was taking place in the upper sanctuary, he "heard a voice from heaven as the voice of many waters and as the voice of a great thunder, and he heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps."

Now, if the spirits of the just made perfect avail themselves of the aid of instrumental music in singing the praises of the Lord, are we, poor mortals, still in our sinful and imperfect state, to refuse such assistance, and thus by implication to accuse the saints in heaven of doing a wrong thing? But it is alleged that wherever the organ is introduced the voice of the people is silenced. If I believed there was any necessary connexion between the use of the organ and the silence of the people, I would never plead for it, for I believe that it is not only the privilege but the duty of the people to take part in the service of sacred song in the sanctuary. But there is no such necessary connexion. There is none such in heaven, for when John heard harpers harping with their harps, he heard at the same time the voice of the saints rising like the sound of many waters and as the voice of a great thunder. And so I believe that when there is true devotion in a congregation, this will call forth the voice of the people, and the judicious use of our instrument will guide and sustain the voices of the people. It is quite true that when the organ is introduced the people very often cease to sing, but this arises from the injudicious use of the instrument, and from the unwise selection of difficult pieces of music unfitted for general congregational use. But let plain, simple tunes only be used, and the use of an instrument, instead of silencing, will call forth the voices of the people. I remember once preaching in a church at Thirsk, in Yorkshire, where the psalmody was led by a clarionet, when the whole congregation joined, and the effect upon me was to elevate my whole soul, and put me into the most favourable frame of mind for the work in which I was engaged. I have heard nothing in the way of argument worthy of a moment's consideration against the use of instrumental music in the worship of God. In coming along in the cars a friend with whom I was arguing attempted to turn the subject into ridicule by proposing that the bagpipe should be introduced. Well, I can see no objection to the use of the bagpipe if you would banish the drones. The simple chanter of the bagpipe would answer well enough for striking the key-note and regulating and sustaining the voices of the people. And it might be well to banish the drones from the church as well as from the bagpipes, unless we could utilize them, as the Irish have improved the drones of their bagpipes by putting keys upon them. The reverend gentleman concluded by proposing that permission be granted to such congregations as are generally agreed upon the subject to avail themselves

of the aid of instrumental music in conducting the people's service of song, but that they be enjoined to use only plain and simple tunes, such as are suitable for general congregational singing.

It was moved in amendment by Mr J. McLACHLAN, seconded by Mr. JOHN ROSS :

"That the Synod dismiss this Overture, and enjoin the Kirk Session and Congregation of Knox Church, Montreal, to conduct Divine Worship agreeably to the law and usages of the Church."

Rev. Mr. McLACHLAN.—Moderator, I rise to oppose the motion, and to move an amendment. Labouring under the disadvantage of not hearing well, I but very seldom occupy any part of your time in addressing the house. This is a question, however, of such importance that I cannot let it pass with a silent vote. I shall, therefore, claim my privilege as a member of this Court in giving an honest expression of my convictions on the subject. I feel constrained in conscience to oppose this overture for various weighty reasons, chiefly because the use of instrumental music in the public worship of God would prove a fruitful source of strife and division in this Church ; because it would break up the harmony and uniformity in divine worship, which now happily prevails ; and above all, because I am persuaded that the use of instrumental music in the worship of God is unwarranted and unauthorized in the New Testament Church, of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the alone Head and King and Legislator, who hath left this solemn charge with His servants and His Church—"Observing all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you alway," &c. Now we ask, where hath He commanded or authorized the use of instrumental music in the worship of God ? or where have we any example of it in the Acts of the Apostles or in the history of the primitive Christian Church ? We hold that there is no authority, whether by precept or example, emanating from our blessed Lord, or from any of His inspired apostles, for the use of instrumental music, and in the absence of any such authority for it, would it not be hazardous, would it not be presumptuous to introduce any foreign element into the sacred territory of God's holy worship ? In that case might not the Lord justly say, "Who hath required this at your hands ?" Is it not solemnly declared that "God is a spirit, and they that worship must worship Him in spirit and in truth." "We are the circumcision who

worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus." "But be ye filled with the spirit, singing to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord." Now, let these respected brethren, who have overtured the Synod on this subject, point out to us any expressed authority from Christ our Lord or his inspired apostles for the use of instrumental music in the New Testament Church, or any example of the kind in the primitive church after the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Let them point out verse and chapter in the New Testament in proof of it. This, I am fully persuaded, they cannot do; but, instead of this, they draw all their arguments in favour of instrumental music from the ritualism of the Mosaic economy, or from human expediency, overlooking the fact that the Christian Church is differently constituted altogether, and that the Gospel is a new and more spiritual dispensation. But until they do this, we will never yield them the matter in question, and we hold that it would be *ultra vires* of this Court to grant them what they pray for in this overture. This Synod, Sir, hath no power and no authority to add to or to alter the ordinances which Christ has instituted in His Church. This Synod hath no power to legislate on its own authority, independently of the revealed will and authority of our Lord Jesus Christ. We must observe all things whatsoever He hath commanded us, and, by parity of reasoning, we are equally bound to reject all rites and ceremonies which He hath not commanded us. This overture now before us, let it be observed, is based on a wrong foundation—on the assumption, viz., that the church or church courts have a discretionary power to regulate the manner of divine worship, or "that the church hath power to decree certain rites and ceremonies in connection with the worship of God," a principle which is held and acted on both by the Church of Rome and the Church of England, and which has opened the floodgates of innovation and will-worship in both, but a principle which we repudiate as anti-Christian and a direct usurpation of the sacred prerogatives of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the King of Zion and Head of His Church. We deny the thing *in toto*. We hold that the church never possessed such a discretionary power since it was a church, never under the Old Testament, much less under this gospel dispensation. It amounts to nothing less than sacrilege and superstition on the part of the church to assume or to practise such a discretionary power, either in the matter or in the manner of God's worship. In vain

do these brethren tell us that instrumental music was employed in the worship of God under the Old Testament, and that with the divine approbation. We readily grant it. But so also was sacrifice. So also were their meats and drinks, and divers washings and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation. So also were all those rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic economy, of which instrumental music was a part, and we tell them that with those rites and ceremonies of Judaism we have nothing more to do. They have served their purpose long ago. They have been entirely abolished. They are dead and gone for ever. I am aware, indeed, that this is denied by our opponents, in so far as the use of the organ is concerned. They maintain that this particular part of the Jewish ritualism has not been repealed, and on this ground they contend for the continued use of it in the gospel church. But if it has not been repealed and abolished, together with that ritualism of which it formed a part, we may justly ask why is there no mention made of the organ or of any other instrument of music in the primitive Christian church? Why was it left in abeyance for so many ages after the Christian era? Why was it left in the grave of oblivion until the 8th or 9th century of the Christian era, until those times which are emphatically called the *dark ages*, when darkness covered the land and gross darkness the people; for it is a well known historical fact that it was in those dark ages of growing corruption and superstition the organ began to be introduced into the church? In vain do these brethren tell us that instrumental music is habitually employed by some other churches. We know it, but surely that is no authority and no example for imitation to us. To their own Master they stand or fall. So are many other unscriptural and superstitious usages, such as the sacrifice of the mass, kneeling at the Lord's table, sponsors and signing of the cross in baptism, the surplice and priestly garments, and the whole of that grand ritualistic movement which is making such rapid strides towards Rome in the present day. Against these, and all unscriptural innovations and superstitions, we must solemnly protest. We lift our solemn testimony against them, and we say to our people, "Touch not, taste not, handle them not, which things are to perish with the using, after the commandments and doctrines of men." In vain do these brethren tell us that the use of the organ in public worship is most agreeable to their taste. No doubt of that. But let us remind them that many things

may be agreeable to the taste and vain imagination of man which are abomination in the sight of God. We tell them decidedly that we have no divine warrant or authority for the use of the organ, and consequently the use of it is unlawful and wrong in the worship of God. We fear that this restless hankering after instrumental music indicates a low state of spiritual and experimental religion. Let these brethren pray more earnestly for the spirit—let them be filled with the spirit, and then they will need no extraneous aid, then they will be singing and making melody in their hearts to the Lord ; and we tell them, moreover, that if the use of the organ be agreeable to them, it would assuredly be most disagreeable to the conscience of a large number of their Christian brethren in this church, insomuch that if the Synod was to grant the prayer of this overture, and to authorise the use of instrumental music in the worship of God, I much fear that the knell of the Canada Presbyterian Church as a pure and prosperous church of Christ would be rung, and that thousands of its faithful would be constrained in conscience to abandon its fellowship, and to go forth under the banner of Christ's crown and covenant that they might worship God in spirit and in truth, with one heart and one mind, without any human inventions savouring of Judaism and popery and superstition. I beg leave, therefore, to move that the synod dismiss this overture.

The Rev. WILLIAM COCHRANE, of Brantford, then spoke substantially as follows :—Moderator, I extremely regret that any effort is made in this Synod to abridge the liberty of debate on this most important question, or that it should be regarded as a minor matter scarcely deserving of our patient attention. I hold, sir, that no question more important, as regards the continued and increasing prosperity of the Canada Presbyterian Church, has come before us for years, and whatever be the decision arrived at, the present discussion must have a very direct bearing upon our prospects as a church for a considerable period to come. It is not simply the case of a single church that we are now considering, but, along with it, the interests of the entire church in the Dominion of Canada, east and west. The motion I beg to submit, which is seconded by the Rev. D. INGLIS, is as follows :—

“ That the memorial from the Kirk Session of Knox's Church, Montreal, be sent down to Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions for their consideration during the ensuing ecclesiastical year, with instructions to report their views to the clerk of the Synod before its expiry ; and that meanwhile the following be the interim act for the guidance of the church during the year :

“ The Synod, desirous of meeting as far as possible the earnest wishes of

congregations who desire greater liberty in the forms of worship than may be in accordance with the long-established usage of the church, and at the same time maintaining intact the rights of Presbyteries and the principle of Presbyterian Church government, declares that all such arrangements as have in view a change in the mode of conducting psalmody shall be regulated by the Presbytery of the bounds ; further, that any congregation or congregations, unanimately or by majorities, desirous of introducing instrumental music to aid in the worship of God, shall petition their respective Presbyteries thereanent, stating the measure of unanimity that prevails in said congregations, and any other circumstances having a bearing on the application, and that the decision of Presbytery in view of all the facts of the case shall be absolute until and unless reversed by the Synod."

Before speaking to the merits of the motion, let me say, sir, how deeply grieved I have been to hear it stated on the floor of this Synod that the desire for instrumental music is evidence of want of piety in our churches, or as one speaker stated, "indicates a want of experimental religion." I protest against such a sweeping charge brought against the memorialists from Knox Church, Montreal, or any of our churches who hold the same views in this matter. If gentlemen who make such statements knew the character of the men who composed that session, so ably represented here to-day, they would pause before uttering such uncharitable language. But, sir, it is not only a charge against one church, but against every other evangelical denomination in the land, as well as in Great Britain. The Baptist denomination for many years have almost universally used instrumental music in the worship of God. Will any member of this Court say that it has decreased in vital piety because of this practice? And the same is true of the Congregationalists, the Wesleyan and Primitive Methodists, and the Episcopal Church. For so far as regards decreasing in experimental religion, if their efforts to extend the kingdom of Christ be any evidence, their zeal and piety never was so great as at the present day. Rather, sir, than hold up such denominations to the wholesale condemnation we have heard, it were well for us as a church in many respects to imitate their conduct. If a scrutiny could be made of the members of our church who earnestly desire the use of instrumental music to aid in the worship of God, it would be found that among them there are very many whose *piety*, and *zeal*, and *liberality* will bear comparison with any who hold contrary opinions. But it is said, we must as a church resist the organ because it is an innovation ; and this word "innovation" is now found on the lips of every one who opposes progress in any direction whatever, no matter how desirable the object contemplated may be. Some good people seem to think that if they can but cry "innovation"

it is an end of all controversy. Now, it is no argument to say that the use of instrumental music in the worship of God is an innovation unless it is an evil, and calculated to injure our usefulness as a church. Do I need to remind members of Synod that within the last century the Presbyterian Church of the mother country has silently permitted innovation after innovation against the established usage of the church, without a single word of remonstrance? There was a time when it was the almost universal custom to read out the psalm, line by line, and yet this has been long ago abolished, and our present system adopted without one word of complaint. There was a time when it was considered a mortal sin in the eyes of many good men to sing a repeating tune, or to sanction a choir to assist in the praise of God. There was a time when it would have been considered a flagrant breach of order for any church to adopt the method of simultaneous communion, and yet this is now with us the all but universal practice. Nay, sir, I believe there still remains on the statute book of one of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland a law prohibiting ministers from reading their sermons, a law, permit me to say, that if carried out rigidly in our denomination, might cause considerable trouble to many of our ministers. These "innovations" have all taken place without a single word of complaint and without any evil effects whatever. Unless those who oppose the use of instrumental music *prove it to be in itself sinful*, I cannot see on what grounds they can resist the prayer of the memorialists, and this no member of this Court has yet attempted. I need not enter upon the Biblical view of the question, which has already been sufficiently handled, but will simply say that, while there is nothing either in the Old or New Testaments against the use of the organ, there is much either directly or impliedly in its favour. None of the former speakers who have touched upon the question of Jewish types and ceremonies have shown that the use of the organ under the Old Testament dispensation *was typical*, and if not typical, on what authority do we argue that it is forbidden under the New? If so, then the question of expediency, coupled with the sanction of Scripture, should form a very important element in our decision to-night. But it is said, "if you agitate this question you will produce division," and for the *sake of peace*, whatever be our convictions, we are counselled to forbear. Now, Moderator, I hold that while peace is to be sought after and maintained by all possible means in society and

the church, *not even for the sake of peace* have we any right as a church to introduce a *new*, and shall I say, *unscriptural term* of communion. This I maintain we are doing by saying to churches or to individuals, you cannot belong to our denomination if you desire instrumental music to aid in the worship of God. The true way to secure peace is, in non-essential matters, to allow congregations under proper Presbyterian regulations to worship God with or without the aid of instrumental music, as they shall see proper. For my own part I do not wish the Canada Presbyterian Church to be known only as a "Scotch Church," fettered by petty restrictions which must militate against its success. I desire it to be such in its mode of worship that all classes and all nationalities shall worship within its pale—its boundaries extending to the utmost limit of this New Dominion—so that commensurate with our growing commercial and political greatness, the church shall increase in numbers and in influence. This most desirable end we cannot expect to attain so long as we refuse congregations the liberty in question. Our position as a church in Canada at the present day is very much the position in which the Presbyterian Churches of England find themselves placed. Men like Drs. King and Edmond plainly say that large numbers of Episcopalians, dissatisfied with the present state of their church, are prevented from uniting with them because of the existence of such like prohibitions. They love the Presbyterian form of church government and discipline—they love the truth as proclaimed in Presbyterian pulpits, but they cannot understand, far less sympathize with, a denomination that, in their opinion, makes so much of non-essentials. Now, the sentiments of Drs. King and Edmond, and many of the most prominent ministers of the United Presbyterian Church, represent the feelings of many of our own. I honestly believe that if, as a denomination, we are not losing ground, we are failing to gather in thousands every year who might be with us, and would be with us, but for this prohibition. Nay, more than this, we cannot expect to retain the younger adherents of our churches unless the liberty sought be granted. Our young men and women in innumerable instances are wandering to other churches, and are in danger of being lost to us altogether as a church. My venerable father, Dr. Burns, has just said that "this is the entering of the wedge," and seems to think that if the prayer of the memorial be granted, and an organ introduced into our church, it will soon be found in all.

Yes, Moderator, such is the fact, and I for one am not in the least alarmed at the prospect. If the prayer of the memorial from Knox Church, Montreal, is not granted this year, succeeding Synods will have to deal with other memorials still more urgent, and irresistible Delay or refusal will only have the effect of making congregations more strongly determined to have the concession. Mr. Cochrane then briefly indicated why he preferred his motion to that of Mr. Clark, as more in accordance with Presbyterian Church government, and more likely to meet the views of the Synod.

Dr. IRVINE spoke to the following effect :—He had much to learn and much to unlearn on this subject, for, “after the straitest sect of the Seceders, he was an *Old Light Antiburgher*.” He had never heard a Paraphrase sung in his own mother’s family, nor in the church in which he was born and baptized. And as to instrumental music, it was proscribed. When he turned his mind to the subject, he found an array of prejudice against it which it was no easy task to overcome. He was first led to believe that it was *Jewish*. This he admitted. But if Jewish, it must be a *civil*, or a *ceremonial* or a *moral* institute. No one will for a moment dream that it was civil ; and if ceremonial, it must be typical, and if typical, it must have an antitype. He could find an antitype for most of the types. He saw in the paschal sacrifice, “Christ our passover sacrificed for us ;” in the goat on the day of the great National Atonement, Christ bearing away the sins of an elect world. So in the burnt-offering, and sin-offering, and trespass-offering, and peace-offering, as well as in the diverse workings of the law, type answering to antitype ; but he could find no antitype for the instrumental music of the temple service. Hence he inferred that it was not typical, not ceremonial. If it was, we had the strange anomaly of a type without an antitype—a shadow without a substance. But that it was not ceremonial is easily proven, from the fact that it existed before the law was given from Sinai, and was not formally introduced as a part of the ceremonial service for several centuries after. Instrumental music was employed by Moses and Miriam in commemorating the passage of the Hebrew people through the Red Sea and the destruction of Pharaoh’s hosts.

“Sound the loud timbrel o’er Egypt’s dark sea,
Jehovah has triumphed—his people are free.”

So that the use of the timbrel and other instruments was

allowed before the ceremonial law was given, and several centuries after we find it adopted by David and Solomon as an aid in praising God. Now we know that the law of capital punishment was given in the time of Noah, and the law of the Sabbath existed from the time of Adam, yet both these are incorporated with the precepts of the decalogue, because they are in themselves moral and right. So it seems that the aid of instruments in divine praise existed before the law, and being deemed essential to praise, after the delivering of the law, was a divine, and therefore a moral institute; and being right in itself, it could not be limited or confined to any dispensation of our world's or church's history; and if moral, it is unrepealable. Ask a Jew, or ask any writer on the types of the Law of Moses, from the inspired author of the Epistle to the Hebrews down: What is the antitype of the psalter, or sacbut, or cymbal, or harp, or organ? and he cannot tell you. The reason is that the organ does not belong to the ceremonial or typical part of God's worship. It is moral—it is binding—it is unchangeable. But again, some say it is Romish, and it is Ritualistic. These are phrases which have recently come to mean something very vague, but very awful. Only cry "Rome" or "Ritual," and you terrify a great number of good, well-meaning, devout Christians. Still, despite the hue and cry of Romanism and Ritualism, we may venture to look calmly at this question. If the organ is Romish, then all the churches that use it must be Romish. Hence, the Episcopal Church of England is Romish; the Methodist Church is Romish; the Congregational, Baptist, N. C. Methodist, the Primitive, the Wesleyan Methodist, the O. S. and N. S. Presbyterian Churches in the United States—all these must be Romish. And the Old Kirk in this New Dominion must be Romish. Nay, the Christian family, and the teacher of the Evangelical Boarding School who uses the piano at family prayers—all these must be Romish. Are the churches or families which have adopted these aids to praise more Romish since they adopted them than they were before? We all know John Calvin's prejudice against the use of instrumental music in the worship of God. Yet when he comes to comment on Colossians iii. 5-16, what are his admissions? Hear his words: "Under the three terms (psalms and hymns and spiritual songs) he includes all kinds of songs. They are commonly distinguished in this way—That a *psalm* is that in the singing of which some *musical instrument* besides the tongue is made use of; a *hymn* is properly a song of praise,

whether it be sung simply with the voice or otherwise ; while an *ode* contains not only praises, but exhortations and other matters." Now, Paul exhorts, nay, enjoins that Christians exhort one another with *psalms*, that is with songs requiring the use of instrumental aid. If you give up the instrument, you must give up the psalms, for they twain are united, and their united use enjoined, as clearly enjoined as the use of the voice and the spiritual song or ode. Hence, the conclusion is, that according to Paul the use of instrumental aid is as positively enjoined in the New Testament as the injunction "Go into all the world and preach the gospel unto every creature," or "This do in remembrance of me." There is yet another fearful obstacle which many dread in regard to the use of instrumental aid in Divine worship. It is the hue and cry of *innovation*. Our fathers were opposed to it ; John Knox was opposed to it. Now, I would be one of the last to lay a sullied finger on any institution which the great and good Scottish Reformer founded. I know too well what the civilized world owes to the Reformer "who never feared the face of man." I know what he did for Scotland and for the colonial dominions of Imperial Britain. I know what the Bible and the Shorter Catechism which he gave to Scotland have done for the emigrant sons of that country. They have made Scotchmen the foremost men in the colonies. They have placed the commerce, the education, the agricultural interests, the moral and the social institutions of these Provinces to-day in the hands of Scotchmen. But I would ask if John Knox were living to-day would he not be among the first of men to avail himself of the progress of science and the social arts ? (A voice, "No.") Yes, he would. Would he send a telegram from Edinburgh to Geneva to consult his friend, John Calvin, upon a question in Biblical criticism ? Would he sail by a steamboat from the Broomielaw to London ? or cross the Atlantic in the "Great Eastern ?" Would he insist on the mode of church discipline which obtained in his day and time in the Church of Scotland ? A century after his day physical discipline was allowed in the Church of Scotland. But we have many innovations, if such they be, in the church which have not been condemned. When I was ordained I signed the "Confession of Faith" as a whole, yet in this very Church, and in my own day, you have made a new Confession of Faith, for you have affixed a note to the 23rd chapter, and you have made many other innovations equally serious. Nay, you are innovating all the time. The

Sabbath School is an innovation. The half-hour sermon is an innovation. The time was when a "bawbee elder" stood at the door of the Church with a pewter plate before him to receive the Sabbath collections. Now the plate passes from pew to pew to receive the weekly offerings. This is a fearful innovation on the "good old ways." If these innovations glorify Christ and advance the interests of his kingdom in the hearts of his people, then God speed all such innovations !

Rev. DAVID INGLIS, in seconding Mr. Cochrane's motion, said :—When the subject of the use of instrumental music was before the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada ten years ago, I took strong grounds against its use in public worship. I did so under the conviction that to seek the aid of an organ in connection with public praise is contrary, not indeed to any express command of the Word of God, but to the whole spirit of our New Testament worship. It is not pleasant to recede from a position to which one has publicly committed himself, yet this I am constrained to do, as my opinions have been very greatly modified within the last five or six years. I am not able to agree with much that has been said on both sides of the question. I cannot agree with those who have maintained that we are commanded to worship God with musical instruments, and who have classed the allusions to the use of such instruments in the Bible as belonging to the moral precepts that are necessarily and universally obligatory. On this principle there is positive sin in not using such instruments. These are extreme views on the one side that will not stand the test of being followed out to their proper conclusions. On the other hand, the instruments of music did not belong to the class of typical enactments. The types of the Old Testament have their fulfilment in our Lord Jesus Christ as the antitype. They were figures of great things to come ; but no one will rank the allusions to the use of the harp or the timbrel in the Old Testament with the positive enactments which prefigured the mediatorial person, office, and work of our Lord Jesus Christ. The use of the organ cannot properly be regarded as a return to the abrogated ritual of the Jews, of which it did not form a part. As an aid in leading the praise of the great congregation, it may be used without doing violence to the simplicity of New Testament worship. In the ten minutes allowed to each speaker I cannot enter fully into the arguments. I may, however, notice that we have in

the Bible allusions to the use of instruments of music, not only in connection with the temple worship, but also in passages that are clearly prophetic of Messianic times. They are never spoken of alone, as taking the place of vocal, articulate and intelligent praise from the lips of living men, but as accompaniments of the psalms sung in public worship. It is alleged that we have no traces of their use in the Apostolic Church. True, but for this obvious reason, that the Church during the age of the apostles was not in circumstances to render the use of such instruments possible. In reference to the New Testament worship, we have no such minuteness of enactment as in the Jewish Church. We are not, indeed, at liberty to invent new institutions, or to alter those appointed; to the apostolic rules we must firmly adhere, but their enactments relate exclusively to what is essential; in reference to what is merely circumstantial, we have only general instructions. It is a fact worthy of our notice here, that while the apostles, writing not only for their own times, but for the whole Christian Church of every age, unfold all the principles of the great apostacy, not one word can be found in these apostolic writings warning the Church against danger in the use of instruments of music. The apostles warned the Churches against a return to the ceremonies of an abrogated ritual, yet in vain do we search their writings for anything like a warning against that which is claimed by many to belong pre-eminently to these "weak and beggarly elements." Are we then to make the forbidding of the use of instruments in public worship a term of communion? Allusion has been made to the fact that a melodeon is used in one of the congregations under the care of the Presbytery of Hamilton. The case of that congregation illustrates the point which I wish to bring out. That congregation belonged to the American Presbyterian Church, and they have used the instrument for many years. Five or six years ago they applied to be taken under our care. Would we have been warranted to refuse them on the ground that they had such an instrument? Would we be warranted in refusing other congregations who use the organ, such as the American Presbyterian Church of Montreal, if they were to make application to be received into our Church? I do not think we would. I am not prepared to make that a term of communion which I cannot find either in the Bible or in our subordinate standards. In reference to the allusions in the Apocalypse to the use of harps in the heavenly worship, it is alleged that this is figurative, and that the idea of actual

harps in heaven is wholly incompatible with all true ideas of the heavenly state. We grant this, and yet we ask would such a figure be employed if the use of these instruments in the Church on earth were contrary to the Divine will, and in opposition to the purity and simplicity of New Testament worship? Are our ideas of heaven to be formed from figures taken from things on earth which the Great Head of the Church disapproves? I acknowledge the practical difficulties of the subject. I have no wish to have the subject agitated in our congregations where there are conscientious differences of opinion, and where, as in my own congregation, it might prove an element of strife and discord. But, on the other hand, I cannot be a party to making it a term of communion, and denying all liberty to congregations on this subject. I know, Moderator, my time is expired; but there is one thing which I wish to say, and I will do so in a sentence or two. It has been asserted here that the use of the organ is an act of will-worship, and if so a heinous sin. Do those who make such declarations think of the consequences to which this statement leads? If we declare the use of the organ to be will-worship, sinful in the sight of God, we cut off from our fellowship all the Presbyterian, Congregational, and other Churches who do allow its use, and every time we take part in the worship of such congregations we sanction this sin, and are ourselves guilty of it. Surely it becomes us to be careful as a Synod that, in resisting innovations, we take our stand, not on mere customs or preconceived opinions, but on the firm rock of the Word of God. The very necessity for seeking to conserve the scriptural doctrine and order of our Church should cause us to guard against dealing with the circumstantial as though it were the essential.

The hour of eleven o'clock having arrived, on motion of the Hon. Mr. McMurrich, the Synod agreed to sit for half an hour longer.

Dr. BURNS stated very decidedly his conviction that such an overture as that from Montreal was just one of the very cases against which the "Barrier Act" was intended to guard. That Act was specially meant for the protection of the Presbyterian worship as established at the Revolution in 1688, and afterwards by the Act of Union in 1707. The Church of Scotland was always opposed to the use of instrumental music in the public worship of God, and hence the well known announcement of Principal Baillie to the Assembly at Edinburgh, in 1644, was the occasion of great

joy, namely, that one great step in reformation had been taken in the removal of the "great organs" in St. Paul's and in Westminster. But, after the happy settlement of the church's revolution, many of the Episcopal curates in the North of Scotland were allowed to retain their places on easy terms, and there was great danger of their bringing with them their cherished forms of worship, which would necessarily introduce innovations into the church, and the "Barrier Act" was passed for the special purpose of preventing such things. The overture, therefore, if received, must be sent down to Presbyteries for their opinion, and this implies the discussion of it first, and its adoption by the Synod. Dr. Burns did not go so far as to say that the use of organs in the worship of God was sinful and profane, but he would say that it was altogether opposed to the principles and genius of our Presbyterian Church, and would necessarily cause division. The use of trumpets, and organs, and cymbals in the ancient worship of the Temple, and only on particular occasions, belonged to the old Levitical economy, and even under that economy, it never had any place in the service of the synagogue. It was unknown in the time of Christ and His apostles; and Lord Chancellor King tells us, in his work on the "Order of the Primitive Church," that it was then unknown, and he quotes the testimony of Clemens Alexandrinus, and other fathers to prove that they viewed the psaltery, the harp, the organ, and the cymbals as purely emblematical of vocal and spiritual worship. Even after the days of persecution were over, and when wealth flowed into the church at and after the era of Constantine, the splendid churches which then began to be built in cities never had any instrumental accompaniments, nor were organs known till the ninth century, nor in any general use before the twelfth and thirteenth, facts altogether inexplicable on the theory of divine authority or command. He considered the introduction both of liturgies and organs as indications of a bad state of spiritual religion, and he looked on the practice of the larger congregations in the American cities as to music and prayer to be unfavourable to religious advancement. The late excellent Dr. James Alexander, of New York, was so impressed with what he had seen in Scotland of the progress of congregational singing, that he set himself earnestly to accomplish the same thing in New York, and in order to this, the organ in his gorgeous church was silenced. Dr. Burns recommended the non-adoption of the overture.

The Rev. A. F. KEMP said that he felt gratified at the aspect of the discussion. A new light was evidently breaking in on the minds of the brethren on the subject of the organ. Reflection and inquiry were breaking down old prejudices and changing old convictions. Many were now discovering that the Word of God placed no such restrictions on the means of praise as was so confidently assumed by some of their opponents, but gave a large and generous liberty to the Church now as of old wisely to use helps in the expression of the sacrifice of song. He rejoiced to see such progress. He remembered the time when in the city of Kingston, and in the Synod of the former Presbyterian Church of Canada, he stood almost alone in defence of the use of instrumental music in our churches, and could scarcely then find a seconder to a motion on the question, very mild and moderate in its terms. He felt as if he was an apostle of progress when he found that now, after the lapse of seven years, he could reckon around him so many able advocates and defenders of the church's liberty to use an organ. This gave hope that there would shortly be such a general change of feeling and opinion on the subject as would lead the Synod to give its deliberate and hearty sanction to the use of this noble instrument. If there was one feature in the Presbyterian Church more marked than another, during the past two centuries at least, it was its sad neglect of the devotions of the sanctuary, and especially of the service of praise. Since the introduction of the rugged and uncouth versions of the psalms by Colonel Rouse, the English Puritan, the art of psalm singing had almost died out in the Presbyterian Church. Before that time Scotland was celebrated for its skill in the singing of sacred song. It then possessed its psalms and hymns, and knew how to render its melodies with effect in the sanctuary. But from the date of the introduction of Rouse's version, her praise had degenerated to such an extent as to become a byword and a reproach to the church. Of late there had been some attempt at a revival, and some progress had been made. But the work was slow, and, with Rouse's version and the absence of the organ, never could be effected to a satisfactory extent. Choirs might be got up here and there, and they might sing with both beauty and power the songs of Zion, but they would kill out congregational singing, and the people would listen instead of singing. It is choirs, not organs, that destroy congregational singing, and that close the lips of the people. They sing in strains too lofty by far for ordinary voices, and

often choose a kind of ornate music lacking simplicity, with which, for the most part, the common people had no sympathy. The organ, on the contrary, invited singing. It created an atmosphere of sound, in the breath of which a congregation's praise could live. He would despair of any progress in the art and act of praise in our churches until the church took a larger view of its own liberties, and left congregations free to use the organ as they liked. He regretted the opposition of their Highland brethren. Why should they seek to interfere with the liberty of others in this matter? No one thought of interfering with their Gaelic songs or Gaelic music! They had no less than two metrical versions of the Psalms of acknowledged excellence from which to choose. They had a peculiar way, too, of intoning and singing the psalm. He would let them have their own way. Why should they not reciprocate, and let others praise God in such ways as they thought for edification and to be agreeable to His word? Let them study the conscience of others as well as their own. With many it was a matter of conscience to use every means which Christian liberty might allowably make available for heightening the effect of praise, and making it an edifying means of grace. They believed that this could not be generally done without the use of an instrument, and why should they be hindered from using that instrument known as the organ, which had been for ages consecrated by the almost universal consent of Christendom to the service of God in the church's praise? The opponents of this liberty had, in the person of one of the speakers to-night, threatened a disruption on the question. He was sorry to hear such incautious words fall from their venerable father. He did not think they would or could do that. Other bonds would bind them still. But if they did leave us they would soon rue the day. They would, ere a generation passed, be left high and dry. Their young people would leave them by the score. They might grip fast the sack that contained the wheat, but the wheat would leak out in spite of them, and they would be left with the empty sack in their hands. They would soon, like the ancient Cameronians of Scotland and Ireland, cease to exert any influence at all on the country or people to which they belonged. Brethren should remember that outside of the church great progress had been made in these days in the education and culture of the young. It was not now as it was in the days of their boyhood when the study of music had little or no place in their scholarship. The youth of

these days were being taught music as a science. There is scarcely a family connected with our town and city churches in which will not be found one or more of its members who have been trained in the art of musical expression by the most skilled masters of the day. The ears of very many of our people are familiar with the magnificent harmonies of Beethoven, the rich melodies of Mozart, the sweet airs of Donizetti and Verdi, and the wonderful oratorios of Handel and Haydn. They can relish and feel the powers of these immortal compositions. By these their souls are filled with a delight that can only be likened to the joys of heaven. But what must be the effects on their minds when they come into the church of the living God—the very gate of heaven—and find there a music that grates like an iron rasp on the ear, that offends good taste, that must be pronounced miserable in the extreme. What wonder if such persons should seek other communions more faithful to God in their service of song, and find in them a stimulus to piety and an edification which they fail to find even in our more scriptural communion. If we would keep our place as a church in the great centres of population, and exert our fair influence on the rising generation, we must not say to our people, “You shall not have organs,” and thus condemn them to a low style of praise; but rather we must grant them a just liberty in the use of instruments, with the fair reservation that in the exercise of it the peace of their consciences will not be disturbed.

It was moved by Mr. D. WATERS, seconded by Mr. ROBERT HALL:

“That the Synod, while recognizing the importance of the subject brought up by the Overture from the Kirk Session of Montreal, and the necessity for improvement in the Service of Praise in the congregations of our Church, consider it inexpedient to agitate, at this time, the question of Instrumental Music in the service of Praise, therefore the Synod declines to grant the prayer of the Overture.”

It was moved in further amendment by Mr. J. M. KING, seconded by Mr. J. McTAVISH:

“That it is inexpedient to comply, at this time, with the prayer of the Overture, but resolve to send it down to Presbyteries and Sessions, with instructions to report thereon to next Synod, so as to guide the Supreme Court in coming to a decision on the subject.”

Near the close of the additional half hour for which the

Synod had agreed to sit, the previous question was moved, and was decided in the negative.

At the end of the time agreed upon, the Synod proceeded to take the vote upon the motions before the House, when the amendment of Mr. King was, successively, carried by large majorities over the amendments, respectively, of Mr. Watson, Mr. Cochrane, and Mr. McLachlan, and over the motion of Mr. Clark ; and the Synod decided in terms of the said amendment. The yeas and nays being taken, the said amendment was declared to be affirmed, almost unanimously.

Dr. IRVINE, for the Kirk Session and congregation of Knox Church, Montreal, craved extracts, which were granted.

On Monday, June 10th, the Synod took up a Reference from the Presbytery of Montreal, in the matter of Dr. IRVINE'S appeal from a decision of the Presbytery of Montreal, in regard to the use of a musical instrument in Knox Church, Montreal.

The Reference and relative papers were read and received.

Mr. JOHN ANDERSON and Mr. NATHANIEL PATERSON were heard in explanation and support of the Reference.

Dr. IRVINE was heard in explanation of his position in regard to the Reference.

It was moved by Mr. DAVID INGLIS, seconded by Mr. J. McTAVISH :—

That the Synod sustain the Reference and dismiss the Appeal of Dr. Irvine, and appoint a Commission of Synod to take such action as may be necessary, in order to secure that the use of the organ in Knox Church, Montreal, be discontinued in the meantime. The Commission to consist of the following gentlemen: Messrs. T. Wardrope, (Convener), W. McLaren, W. Aitken, Ministers, Mr. Hay, Dr. Edmondson, Dr. Holden, Elders.

It was moved by Mr. J. M. KING, in amendment, seconded by Mr. J. ROSS, as follows :—

Sustain the Reference; dismiss the Appeal of Dr. Irvine against the decision of the Presbytery of Montreal, instruct the Session of Knox's

Church to discontinue the use of the organ in public worship, until the mind of the Church be ascertained on the subject, by the Reports of Presbyteries and Sessions at next Synod, and to report their compliance with this instruction to the first regular meeting of the Presbytery of Montreal.

A vote was taken on the amendment of Mr. J. M. KING, as against the motion of Mr. D. INGLIS, when the amendment of Mr. KING was carried by a large majority, and the Synod decided in terms thereof.

Mr. JOHN ANDERSON craved extracts on behalf of the Presbytery of Montreal.

MEETING IN KNOX CHURCH.

At a meeting of the Congregation of Knox Church, Montreal, held on 17th July, 1867, duly convened by order of the Kirk Session, to hear their decision, acquiescing and carrying out the order of Synod to discontinue the Organ in the Church; the minute of Session having been read to the Congregation, the following resolution was moved by Mr. ALEX. MCGIBBON, seconded by Mr. JOHN EWART:—

That inasmuch as the decision of Synod, as conveyed to the Session of this Church was arrived at by the Synod on a Reference from the Presbytery of Montreal, and as said Presbytery failed, or neglected to cite the Session or the Congregation, (they being interested parties), to appear for their interests, which was clearly the duty of the Presbytery to do, as directed by the laws of the Church; and inasmuch as the Synod has passed judgment on the Reference, without affording the Session or the Congregation the privilege of being heard in self-defence; therefore be it Resolved, that a respectful Memorial be prepared and transmitted to the Synod at its next meeting, asking for a reconsideration of their decision in this case, and in the meantime the order of the Synod to discontinue the use of the Organ in the Church shall remain in abeyance until an answer to the Memorial is first obtained.

Moved in amendment by Mr. ARCH. SWAN, seconded by Mr. R. C. WILSON:—

That the Congregation having heard the report of the Commissioners appointed by them in support of the Overture from this Congregation to the Synod on the subject of instrumental music, and also having heard from the Session through its Chairman, the Rev. Dr. Irvine, our Pastor, the deliverance of Synod in reference to the Organ now used in our Church, ordering the use of the said instrument in the mean time to be discontinued, while dissenting from said deliverance on what we consider to be sufficient grounds, we yet deem it our duty to submit to the decision of the Superior Court and to discontinue the use of the Organ for the present, awaiting the action of the Synod at its next meeting, on the Overture presented by us, and, that a Committee be now appointed to draw up a document stating the reasons and grounds for such dissent, the same to be engrossed in our Session Records.

Mr. McGIBBON, in speaking to his motion, said that so far as the decision regarding the Overture was concerned, he thought every one should be satisfied ; but that was not the subject which they had to consider at this time. The question now was the decision of the Synod on the Reference introduced by the Presbytery of Montreal, in which this Congregation was condemned by the Synod in a most tyrannical manner. The introduction of instrumental music into the Church was one of great importance and, from the feeling shewn in the Synod by most of the leading ministers, he was sure that before very long organs would be introduced into most of the Churches. The feeling was getting too strong and could no longer be resisted by the prejudice and intolerance of the few. This was clearly shewn in the discussions at the late Synod. What we have to decide upon to-night, however, is—Shall we, as a Congregation, submit to an illegal decision ? a decision arrived at in opposition to the Synod's own laws and regulations, and on which some of the majority voted more from personal feeling and petty spite, than for the good of the Church or the glory of the Master they profess to serve. He contended they would be justified in resisting this tyrannical proceeding on the part of the Synod, and quoted from the "*Book of Forms*" the various clauses bearing on such cases. If Mr. King had made a general motion, including all Congregations, there would have been less to complain of, but as he had singled out this Congregation as one on which to vent his wrath, he felt bound in conscience to resist to the very utmost. There was a great principle involved here which required to be kept in view. Once allow yourselves to be trampled upon in this way—and there was an end to all liberty or progress. He knew that some in the Congregation would sacrifice their rights and liberties for the miserable plea of peace, but, in his opinion, peace obtained at the sacrifice of principle was not worth having ; that would be the peace of the slave who must lie under the lash of the tyrant and dare not open his mouth. A decision in which the rights and interests of this whole Congregation are involved, without being afforded the opportunity of one word in self-defence, was not only wrong, but was "the entering of the wedge" for further encroachments on the rights of Congregations, and he thought it so grossly illegal that they would be justified in disregarding it altogether. The feeling shewn to this Congregation in Synod and Presbytery has certainly not been brotherly, and it looked as if it was intended to drive

us out of the Communion altogether. A striking instance may be seen in the appointment of the College Board for Montreal, on which *not a single subscriber from this Congregation has been placed, although above a dozen names were taken from the other Congregations in the City.* He trusted that the motion would be passed unanimously, as it was moderate in its terms, respectfully framed, and merely asked a reconsideration of the question so hastily decided. He could see no good in acquiescing under a protest. If the decision was wrong—resist it manfully. If it was right, then acquiesce gracefully and ungrudgingly. He thought he had shewn that it was wrong, and if the Congregation wished to maintain its liberties, it could not with any self-respect submit to the decision which had been read that evening and approved of by the Session. He was always of the opinion that the Elders of a Church were bound to look after the interests of the Congregation who elected them, but it seemed the Session of Knox Church did not act on this principle, but in this he had no hesitation in saying they did not represent the feelings of the majority of the Congregation.

Mr. EWART, in seconding the motion, spoke strongly in its favour, maintained that the congregation had an inherent and inalienable right to manage its own internal affairs ; and that the interference on the part of certain members of the Presbytery, should be resisted by every man who held such rights, as he did, to be sacred.

Mr. WM. BROWN said, that as an old Elder of this congregation, and still greatly interested in its progress and prosperity, he would like to be permitted to say a few words on the general question. As allusion had been made to the congregation of Cote des Neiges, where he 'now worshipped, he might say that two years ago the people there had introduced an instrument of music into their congregation. An urgent necessity existed for the step then taken, for there were none specially qualified to lead the service of praise. For a few Sabbaths things went on admirably, young people were gathered into a choir, and there was every promise of success ; but at last, through the clamour of a few, the instrument had to be removed, and with the most lamentable results. He, the speaker, had some ear for music—he knew discord from concord—and he was constrained to say that the singing of the praises of God—that which ought above all things to be distinguished by devoutness and propriety—had become, in that congregation, most offensive to his

ears, and how much more so in the ear of the Most High, before whom we must not offer the blind or the lame. He paid a high compliment to the music as conducted in Knox Church, and expressed his personal gratification and pleasure at being privileged occasionally to join in the same. With regard to the organ question, he had heard but two arguments against the use of instruments of music in our Churches—the first was that it was contrary to use and wont, and the second was that these things had all been forever done away with by the extinction of the temple service, or departed with its rites and its sacrifices. In the first of these statements he thought there was no argument at all, for but the other day it was not use and wont to send messages across an Atlantic cable, and it was not use and wont to travel at great speed on a railroad, and it was not use and wont to send our thoughts abroad by the art of printing. With regard to the second argument, so called, nothing could be plainer than that instrumental music in the praises of the sanctuary was part and parcel of the Book of Psalms. He would call it the very *doctrine* of that book, yea, as much its doctrine as the doctrine of justification by faith is part of the Epistle to the Romans, or the doctrine of a vicarious sacrifice is the doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There is a book—a black book—which is constantly consulted in the Presbytery. He wished the Bible were consulted more. In this case you have that which is superior to all human authority on your side. The conflict in which you are engaged is one of far deeper import than merely one of instrumental music. It is the old question which troubled the Church in the days of the Apostle, Shall we obey God or man? He advised them to go forward fearlessly, undeterred by anything that prejudice or tyranny could say or do. He had been present at the Synod in Toronto, and was grieved and pained beyond measure at what he heard and witnessed there, he had hung down his head with shame, and felt that he could never again take that interest in the Canada Presbyterian Church which he had long done.

Mr. SWAN contended that whatever the Synod did—whether right or wrong—it was the duty of the people to submit; but in this instance the injustice was so glaring he would like to see a strong protest recorded on the Session books.

Mr. WM. ROWAN, Elder, was of the same opinion as

the last speaker. Respect should be maintained to the authority of the Superior Courts, no matter what they decided. He advised unqualified submission, but would not oppose a respectful protest.

Mr. R. C. WILSON was of opinion that the Congregation had been too prosperous, and this difficulty about the organ was a device of the devil, introduced to interrupt and mar the harmony of its members.

Mr. WILLIAM BROWN said he did not know whether Mr. Wilson was correct or not as to this being the work of the devil. Did he mean to say that the respected clergy from Glengarry were the devil's agents, for there had been peace and harmony till they interfered? The prosperity of the Congregation had gone on like a flowing stream till interrupted by the "raid" from Glengarry.

Mr. W. D. McLAREN was of opinion that by acquiescing in this decision now, it would tend to hasten on the prayer of the overture. He was willing to wait until June next.

Mr. THOS. McNAB could only characterize the action of the Synod as nothing else than a piece of ecclesiastical tyranny worthy of the dark ages, a want of Christian liberality, and a most unwarrantable interference with the religious liberty of the subject. He would vote for the motion with all his heart.

Mr. ANGUS McINTOSH supported the motion in a strong speech, stating that if subjected to any further interference of this nature, he was prepared to withdraw from the Canada Presbyterian Church altogether. It was no honour to belong to such a body and controlled by such narrow-minded men. Certainly no benefit had ever been received from either Presbytery or Synod by this congregation.

Mr. GEORGE BROWNE advised submission, though the measure was a very harsh one, but as a congregation of Christians, he would remind them of the words of our Blessed Saviour: "Blessed are they that are persecuted for Righteousness sake," and again, "Pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you."

Mr. WM. F. LIGHTHALL said, he would confine himself in speaking to this question, to the two great principles of right and wrong. If it was right to use instrumental

music in the worship of Almighty God in one place, it was right in another, and if in one congregation then in another, and neither Session, Presbytery, Synod, Assembly nor Church Court had authority to interdict what was right, and *no wrong* could be right. He was in favour of a resolution, setting forth that the Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church, by sending down to Presbyteries for consideration the overture from Knox Church, anent instrumental music in congregational worship, thereby tacitly admitted that such overture was not contrary to the word of God, to any fundamental doctrine of the church, and that such music might be an aid in the congregational worship; that that overture having passed the Synod by a more than two-third majority, had a right to be—as the Moderator of Synod had a right to declare, and did declare it to be—an *interim* law until next meeting of Synod; which decision of the Moderator was reversed on appeal to the vote of the Synod; that the effect of such appeal and vote was to prevent instrumental music from being used in congregational worship until next meeting of Synod; that beyond this, on a reference of Presbytery, with respect to the organ in Knox Church, Montreal, the Synod, contrary to its own laws, and without summoning or notifying Knox Church or its Session, heard such reference, and passed a most harsh, severe, and unjust judgment against the congregation of Knox Church. Besides which, such harsh and severe judgment was pronounced, while it was admitted on the Synod's floor, that two other congregations within the bounds of the Synod—one of them said to be the largest congregation within its bounds—were in constant use of instrumental music in their congregational worship, many churches within its jurisdiction using organs and instrumental music in their Sabbath Schools and basements, and many members of Synod in their families' devotions; and that as the question had already caused scandal, for the peace, harmony, and welfare of the Church, that in his opinion the congregation should adopt the following or in similar terms: That out of respect which the congregation bears to its pastor, and in order to promote the peace, harmony, and welfare of the Church, and for no other reasons whatsoever, the congregation *permits* the resolution of Synod to take effect until next meeting of Synod. 2nd. That the congregation protests that such Resolution of Synod was harsh, unjust, and unwarrantably severe, and more especially so as this congregation had no opportunity, and was not summoned to

defend its rights, as it should have been. And 3rd. That the Session of the congregation in reporting as required by the Resolution of Synod to the Presbytery, cause our dissent and protest with these reasons to be forwarded to the Presbytery and Synod.

Mr. JAS. BROWN spoke impressively and with much feeling, declaring that there was a law in that grand old Book above all the laws of Synods and Presbyteries, and by that law let us stand or fall. The Bible enjoins the use of the organ, and let us take our stand on the Bible, whatever Synods may say or do. He would hold up both his hands for the motion, and hoped it would be carried.

Mr. WILLIAM MCGIBBON said that for over twenty years they had been compelled to have a stand up fight with the old Kirk about Church property, spending money and time, and was this the result of all our troubles—a new campaign entered on with the C. P. Church. He, for one, thought there was far more Christian liberality in the old Kirk than in this persecuting off-shoot. By this time, no doubt, the victory of the Cameron men had been blazed all over Glengarry by the light of bonfires and tar barrels. He would stand such persecution no longer.

Mr. ROBERT GARDNER spoke strongly in support of the motion, and said that he for one would never be a party to acquiesce in such an unrighteous decision as had been read from the Session to-night; and it was evident to him that a great deal of this trouble had arisen from miserable jealousy and petty spleen on the part of outsiders.

At this stage of the proceedings, Mr. D. MACGREGOR rose and asked the Chairman (Rev. Dr. Irvine) what effect it would have upon the Pastor if the motion were carried, as information on this subject would influence several votes, and he for one would not vote for anything to cause Dr. Irvine further trouble, although his sympathies were wholly with the supporters of the motion.

Dr. IRVINE replied that if the motion were carried, the Session would be bound to dissent and record their protest, and he might be forthwith stripped of his gown and bands, and thus be forced to resign.

The supporters of the motion took a different view, contending that the Congregation were a distinct party in this case, and that any action of theirs, simply as a Congre-

gation, could not involve the Minister or Session, so long as their dissent was recorded. Some even contended that if the Synod or Presbytery would act so harshly as indicated by the Chairman, the Congregation had the choice of withdrawing from the body altogether. The motion would have been carried by a large majority but for the statement from the chair, as a number voted in opposition to their own feelings rather than run the remotest risk of losing the services of their pastor.

The motion and amendment were finally put from the chair, when the amendment was carried by a majority of *two*, Mr. A. McGibbon recording his dissent for reasons stated at the time, and which are embodied in the following letter, copied from the "Record" of the Church, published at Toronto :—

MONTREAL, 17th September, 1867.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE RECORD.

SIR.—In the *Record* for September, you publish the resolutions of Knox Church Congregation, Montreal, on the Synod's order to discontinue the use of the organ in that Church. My name is there given as dissenting from the resolution which was carried by a majority of two.

As my reason for this step may be misunderstood, I ask you to allow me a little space for an explanation.

I dissented from the reasons given by the congregation, because I felt that if obedience were due to the Synod's orders, it should be given unconditionally, and I felt that a grudging obedience, accompanied by a protest with reasons was more detrimental to the discipline of the Canada Presbyterian Church, than a refusal on legal grounds to obey an injunction, ordered in contravention of the laws which regulate all proceedings of Presbyteries and Synods. I will not here refer to the steps taken by the Committee appointed by Presbyteries, whose *citation* was altogether irregular, as is acknowledged by all who have looked into the subject. I will confine myself to the reference, and on this the law is very explicit. In the Forms of Procedure, Chap. II., Sec. 2, under the head "References," it is stated that in references for judgment, "all the papers must be regularly transmitted and the parties concerned are warned to appear before the Court, by intimation to them personally if present, or by timely notice sent to them, that they may be heard for their interest." Sec. 13, when other parties are interested in a case carried to a Superior Court, they are necessarily carried along with it, and intimation is made to them that they may appear for their interest. Sec. 14, states proceedings to be taken, one of which is to ascertain, "that parties have all been cited and are present." The order in which parties are to be heard is given, the last being "any other parties having an interest."

Whether the action of the Synod be right or wrong in ordering the discontinuance of the organ in Knox Church, is not now the question, nor is it material to ask whether the hearing of "all parties for their interests" would have made any difference in the judgment. The question is one of

more importance. Can the tyranny of a majority set aside the safe-guards provided by the laws? If it can in one case it may in another. The congregation of Knox Church was not called to appear either before the Presbytery or Synod on the reference, but contrary to law, the majority declared that that congregation must submit, without any opportunity of having its case pleaded. To some this may seem a small thing, but to those who regard the matter in its proper light it is a most dangerous innovation, a large stride towards irresponsible tyranny.

I had intended to quote some instances of the practice of the Synod in previous cases, but they are so numerous that it is almost unnecessary.

I would merely refer to the steps taken with regard to the Brockville Church, in which a musical instrument had been retained for three years, in spite of the orders of Synod.

It will be found at pages 63 and 64 of the Digest of the Synod, and by looking at the latter page it will be seen that *the congregation* was heard through its commissioners, before the Synod ventured to discuss the matter. The contravention of law by a bare majority of a Synod is fraught with incalculable danger, and when the law has been set aside by a small majority in a meeting at which not more than half the members were present, as was the case on the occasion referred to, I for one must raise my voice against it.

I am, Sir, very respectfully yours,

ALEXANDER MCGIBBON.

Mr. Edward Moore, Elder, Mr. W. D. McLaren, and Mr. A. Swan, Deacons, were named a Committee to draft reasons of dissent, who reported as follows, on the 24th July, at the close of the weekly prayer meeting:—

Reasons and grounds of dissent referred to in amendment carried at Congregational Meeting, held on Wednesday, 17th July, 1867.

As a Congregation we feel constrained to enter our solemn dissent both from the action of the Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church, and also from that of the Pesbytery of Montreal, which action has resulted in requiring the discontinuance of the instrument used for the last ten months in aiding the Congregational praise on the Sabbath day, and that for the following among other reasons;—

1st. Because we believe that the Committee, appointed by the Presbytery in January, 1867, to deal with the Kirk Session of this Congregation *anent* the use of said instrument, was not composed of members representing the mind of the whole Presbytery, but only a sectional part, and we complain that the Presbytery should have invited to deal with the office-bearers of this Congregation a few members from rural and remote districts, whose views and prejudices in this matter it was well known did not harmonize, not only with ours but with those of other congregations of the Presbytery.

2nd. We complain that the Presbytery and Synod have acted with apparent partiality in the manner in which they have dealt by the Congregation of Knox Church, Montreal. It is well known to the members of both these bodies that instrumental aid in praising God is in constant use in many of the families, Sabbath Schools and Weekly Services throughout the Church, and also on the Lord's day in some congregations, and yet its use by this congregation could not be tolerated, although the members are *unanimous* in considering it a valuable aid in the Public Praise.

3rd. We deeply regret that we are obliged to complain that the Synod of

the C. P. Church has deviated in this matter from its own published laws and regulations.

I. Inasmuch as the Synod sustained an appeal of the Rev. Dun. Cameron, of Lochiel, against the decision of the Presbytery of Montreal, the said decision of Presbytery, so far as it affected the said Rev. Mr. Cameron, being in the judgment of this Congregation a just one. We hold that Mr. Cameron was not authorized to proceed by *citation*, and that such was his own belief *originally* is shown by the fact that between the hours of 12 noon and 1 P.M., on the day of his appointment, he asked the Moderator of Knox Church Session, if a conference with said session could be had that day, a proceeding which, under the laws laid down *anent* citation in the book of forms and procedure, was utterly incompetent.*

II. It is further to be noted that Mr. Cameron took no official action in the matter from the time of his appointment in the month of January till the 8th April, when he addressed to the Moderator of Knox Church Session, a citation, *unconstitutional* and *irregular*; unconstitutional because without evidence of his authority on the face of it; and irregular, because proceeding in a way unauthorized by the Presbytery—which citation required the session of Knox Church to appear before Mr. Cameron and his committee on the 7th day of May, when he and the committee were coming to the city to attend the quarterly meeting of Presbytery, and *not*, as might be inferred, specially to meet the Session of Knox Church.

III. Before the Session could be held as contumacious, even if Mr. Cameron had been correct in his form of process, the citation should have been repeated thrice, which was not done.

IV. The Presbytery too, after hearing from the commissioners appointed to support the overture on instrumental music, how very *unanimous* the congregation was in desiring the use of the Organ, undertook to pass judgment on the matter without citing either session or congregation to appear for its interests; thereby, as we conceive, not only contravening the rules of procedure, but endangering and jeopardising the peace and harmony of the congregation, all which grave irregularities the Synod sustained.

V. Inasmuch as the Synod took action on the reference from the Presbytery of Montreal *anent* this matter without previously citing either the Session or Congregation to appear for their interests, which is a prescribed law laid down in the "Book of Forms" adopted by said Synod.

VI. Inasmuch as the Synod, though well aware that Knox Church Congregation was *unanimous* in wishing to retain the use of the musical instrument, did, by a large majority, carry a peremptory injunction instructing the Session to have it discontinued and report compliance at the next meeting of the Presbytery of Montreal; thereby bringing the Session and Congregation into direct collision.

VII. Inasmuch as the Moderator of Synod declared the Overture to be an *interim* act, which would have secured the use of the instrument to this congregation for the present year; while such decision was reversed on an appeal to the House on the aforesaid grounds, the Congregation think that they have been treated in a way which in their circumstances they believe to be cruel, partial and unwarrantably severe; nevertheless, because of their unanimous attachment to their beloved pastor, and their disposition to comply

*This request of Mr. Cameron's could not be complied with from the impossibility of calling together Knox Church Session in the afternoon, and the Moderator having a platform appointment on that evening at the anniversary meeting of the Bible Society.

with his wish, as also that of the Session, in yielding to the severe injunction of the Supreme Court, they agree to *permit* the discontinuance of the instrument in the meantime; still cherishing the prayerful hope that the rights solicited in their Overture and Memorial will be accorded at next meeting of Synod.

(Signed,)

ARCH. SWAN,
Chairman.

The foregoing having been read to the Congregation at the close of service on Wednesday, 24th July, the following resolution was moved by Mr. J. H. Mooney, seconded by Mr. A. McIntosh, and carried *nem. con.*

That the reasons of dissent now read, be adopted and ordered to be recorded, and that a copy of the same, accompanied by copies of the resolution and amendment, be sent to the Editor of the "Home and Foreign Record of the Canada Presbyterian Church," as also to the Editors of each of our city papers, for publication.

In November, a meeting, specially called to re-consider the question, was held. This meeting was largely attended, and the whole subject was discussed in the most friendly spirit. A resolution to reverse the decision of the Session, which had been agreed to on the 17th of July by a majority of two, was passed, by which the Congregation asserted its claim to be heard for its interests in any Church Court, refused to acknowledge or submit to a decision illegally come to ordering the organ to be silenced, and maintained its right to use an instrument for leading the Congregational praise, and its determination to do so.

Out of deference, however, to the conscientious scruples of some with regard to resuming the use of the organ immediately, it was resolved not to do so until June, 1868.

